ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

65.3 W34r
Waterland 1230624
eview of the doctrine of the
ucharist
ANNEX

M.L.
ANNEX

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

S10
ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/reviewofdoctrine0000dani

Ernest J. Morgan.
August 7th 1883.

A REVIEW

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

WATERLAND

London

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE

7 PATERNOSTER ROW

A REVIEW

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

WITH

FOUR CHARGES TO THE CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX
CONNECTED WITH THE SAME SUBJECT

BY

DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D.

FORMING PARTS OF VOLS. IV. AND V. OF HIS COLLECTED WORKS

WITH A PREFACE

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON

265.3
W34r

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1880

1230624

PREFACE.

This volume has been issued at the request of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with the view of placing within the reach of those who may not be able to procure the collected Works of Dr. Waterland, and especially of candidates for Holy Orders, a treatise which was once considered almost as the text-book of the Church of England on the subject of the Eucharist, but which, in common with many of the works of the great Anglican Divines, has been somewhat cast into the shade by the lapse of time and the rapid issue of modern theological literature, and is, there is reason to fear, far less known at present than it deserves.

Though suggested probably, on the one hand, by the publication of Mr. Johnson's 'Unbloody Sacrifice,' and by Dr. Brett's 'Discourse Concerning the Necessity of Discerning the Lord's Body,' and, on the other, by the Socinianising tracts of Bishop Hoadley on the Lord's Supper, and by an

amicable controversy in which the Author had been engaged with Dr. Zachary Pearce, yet the 'Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist,' as Bishop Van Mildert has observed, 'has little the aspect of a *polemical* work, although so large a portion of it may be applied as a corrective, or a preventive, of error. With scarcely any personal reference to the living authors of his time who entertained different views of the subject from that which he supported, Dr. Waterland has so conducted his train of reasoning and investigation, as to meet all their diversities of opinion in their full force; stating them with candour and fairness, and controverting them with no less moderation than ability and decision.'

And the three Charges to the Clergy of Middlesex which defend and supplement his former treatise,—that 'On the Christian Sacrifice' (with its Appendix in reply to Johnson), that 'On the Sacramental Part of the Eucharist,' and that 'On the Distinctions of Sacrifice,'—occasioned though they were by 'Some Remarks on the Review' by Dr. Brett, are equally devoid of controversial acrimony, nor are they of merely local or personal application. They form, together with the 'Review,' a body of teaching on the doctrine of the Eucharist, especially with reference to the various opinions on this vital subject which have been maintained within our own Church,

almost equally applicable to all times, and having a peculiar interest and importance in our own. The wide and intimate acquaintance which Waterland possessed, not only with the Christian Fathers but with the Romish Theologians and the writings of the foreign Reformers, the perfect fairness with which he, almost invariably, states and meets the views and reasoning which he controverts, and the singular simplicity, clearness, and vigour of his style, have placed him among the most trustworthy and instructive of our own Divines: and while asserting and defending, as the true doctrine of the Eucharist, the *via media* between two extremes, which, though not excluded by the tolerant moderation of our Articles and formularies, have each too facile a tendency to pass into serious error, he will be found, even by those whom he does not convince, to leave them in no doubt as to the meaning of his language and the bearing of his arguments; and by others, and especially by students in divinity, a safe and perspicuous guide to those tenets on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which, as a matter of fact, have been held by the great majority of the ablest and most learned Theologians of the Reformed Church of England.

J. L.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity 1

An Introduction, first briefly shewing the Design of the Treatise, and next premising some Considerations: viz.—

I. That Scripture is our only Rule 3

II. That for the right understanding of Scripture, it is of great moment to know what the most eminent Writers before us have taught, and what they have agreed in 3

1. More particularly, Ancients first 5
2. And then Moderns 6

III. That of the two Extremes, Profaneness and Superstition, the latter is the safest for any one to lean to 8

IV. That it is injuring and degrading the Sacraments to call them Positive Duties, rather than Religious Rites . . 11

1. The Eucharist not merely a Duty, but a sacred Rite, wherein God bears a Part 11

2. That Part of it which is Duty, is not a single Duty, but more 13

CHAP. I.—*Explaining the most noted or most considerable Names of the Holy Communion* 16

1. Breaking of Bread 16
2. Communion 18
3. Lord's Supper 19
4. Oblation 21
5. Sacrament 26
6. Eucharist 29
7. Sacrifice 30
8. Memorial 32
9. Passover 34
10. Mass 37

PAGE

CHAP. II.—*Considering the Institution of the Holy Communion, as recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul* 38

It came in the place of the Jewish Passover 41

1. Resembling it in several Circumstances 42
2. Deriving its Forms and Phrases from it 43

CHAP. III.—*Concerning the Commemoration of Christ, in the Holy Communion* 46

1. Remembering him as God-Man 48
2. Commemorating him as such 54
3. Celebrating his Memorial 58

CHAP. IV.—*Concerning the Commemoration of the Death of Christ* 62

1. As an expiatory Sacrifice 63
2. Which is applied in the Eucharist 69

CHAP. V.—*Of the Consecration of the Elements* 74

1. In what sense they are blessed or consecrated 74
2. By whom they are blessed 77
3. What the Blessing amounts to 79

CHAP. VI.—*Of Spiritual Feeding according to John* vi. . . . 89

1. The Sense of the Ancients on that head 99
2. The Sentiments of Moderns 123

CHAP. VII.—*Of Sacramental, Symbolical Feeding in the Eucharist* 129

1. The Sentiments of the Ancients on that head 141
2. The Sentiments of Moderns 163

CHAP. VIII.—1 *Cor.* x. 16 *explained and vindicated from misconstruction* 175

Objections answered 194

CHAP. IX.—*Remission of Sins conferred in the Eucharist* . 210

Proved from Scripture 218
From Antiquity 220
Judgment of the Reformers, and of the Church of England . 225
Objections removed 228

PAGE

CHAP. X.—*Sanctifying Grace conferred in the Eucharist* . 238
Proved from 1 Cor. x. 16 240
Proved from John vi. 240
Proved from Analogy 241
Proved from 1 Cor. xii. 13 241
The Judgment of the Ancients hereupon 248
The Sentiments of Moderns on the same 258

CHAP. XI.—*The Eucharist considered as a Federal Rite* . . 278
Argued from the Nature of Communion 285
From the Custom of drinking Blood in Covenants . . . 286
From the Words of Institution 286
From the Analogy between that and Sacrifices, or Sacrificial Feasts 289
Objections to Dr. Cudworth's Notion considered and confuted 291

CHAP. XII.—*The Eucharist considered in a Sacrificial View* . 306
Some Account of Dr. Grabe's Sentiments 307
The Eucharist a spiritual Sacrifice, how 310
The Judgment of the Ancients on that head 312
The Judgment of Moderns 349

CHAP. XIII.—*Of the Preparation proper for the Holy Communion* 351
1. Baptism 352
2. Competent Knowledge 353
3. Sound Faith 353
4. True Repentance 354
Consisting chiefly in Restitution 358
Readiness to forgive 362
Peaceableness 366
Charity to the Poor 366

CHAP. XIV.—*Of the Obligation to frequent Communion* . . 369
How stated in the several Ages of the Church:
First Century 371
Second 372
Third 374
Fourth 374
Fifth 386
Sixth 389
Seventh 390
Eighth 390

PAGE

The Doctrinal Use of the Christian Sacraments considered: in a Charge delivered to the Middlesex Clergy, May 12th, 1736 . . . 395

The Christian Sacrifice Explained, in a Charge delivered in part to the Middlesex Clergy at St. Clement-Danes, April the 20th, 1738. To which is added an Appendix 413

The Sacramental Part of the Eucharist Explained, in a Charge delivered in part to the Clergy of Middlesex, at the Easter Visitation, 1739 485

Distinctions of Sacrifice; set forth in a Charge delivered in part to the Clergy of Middlesex, at the Easter Visitation, 1740 . . 543

A REVIEW OF THE DOCTRINE

OF

THE EUCHARIST,

AS LAID DOWN IN

SCRIPTURE AND ANTIQUITY.

Ut autem literam sequi, et signa pro rebus quae iis significantur accipere, servilis infirmitatis est; ita inutiliter signa interpretari, male vagantis erroris est.

Augustini de Doct. Christ. lib. iii. cap. 9. p. 49.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN the latter part of the sixth chapter, I have followed the common opinion of learned Protestants, (Mr. Bingham, Dr. Wall, &c.) in relation to Infant Communion, as prevailing in the fifth century, under a notion of its strict necessity, built upon John vi. 53. Though I had some scruple about it; as may appear by my manner of expressing myself, and by the reference to Thorndike in note [k].

Having since looked somewhat deeper into that question, I think it now just to my readers to advertise them, that I apprehend that common opinion to be a mistake; and that though the practice of giving Communion to children at ten or at seven years of age (or somewhat sooner) was ancient, and perhaps general, yet the practice of communicating mere infants, under a notion of its necessity, and as built upon John vi, came not in before the eighth or ninth century, never was general; or however lasted not long in the West, where it first began. My reasons for this persuasion are too long to give here: but I thought this short hint might be proper, to prevent misconceptions as to that Article.

THE INTRODUCTION.

MY design in this work is to treat of the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, according to the light which Scripture and right reason afford, making use of such helps and means for the interpreting Scripture, as God's good providence, in former or later ages, has furnished us with. The subject is of very great weight in itself, and of near concern to every Christian; and 'therefore ought to be studied with a care proportioned to the importance of it: that so we may govern both ourselves and our people aright, in a matter of such consequence; avoiding with great caution the extremes on both hands, both of excessive superstition on one hand, and of profane neglect on the other. We are now visibly under the extreme of neglect; and therefore we ought to study by all means possible to inspire our people with a just respect for this holy institution, and to animate them to desire earnestly to partake often of it; and in order to that, to prepare themselves seriously, to set about it with reverence and devotion, and with those holy purposes, and solemn vows, that ought to accompany it [a].'

But before I enter upon the main subject, it may not be improper here to throw in some previous considerations, in order to prepare my readers for what they will find in this treatise, that they may the more easily form a true and sound judgment of the subject-matter of it.

I. The first consideration is, that Scripture alone is our complete rule of faith and manners, 'containing all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation [b].'

Whatever Scripture contains, either in express words rightly understood, or by consequence justly deduced, is Scripture doctrine, and ought to be religiously believed and obeyed; allowing only for the different degrees of importance belonging to different Scripture truths, or Scripture precepts.

II. For the right understanding of Scripture, it is of great

[a] Bp. Burnet on Article XXXI. p. 484. [b] Article VI.

moment to know what the most eminent writers or teachers, ancient and modern, have thought before us on the same subject; and more especially to observe what they unanimously agreed in. For, as they had the same Scriptures before them, and the same common reason to direct them, and used as much care and diligence, and were blessed with as great integrity as any of us now can justly pretend to, their judgment is not to be slighted, nor their instructions to be despised. The 'responsa prudentum,' the reports, precedents, and adjudged cases are allowed to be of considerable weight for determining points of law: and why should they not be of like weight, ordinarily, for the determining points of theology? Human law there, and Divine law here, is properly the authentic rule of action: but the common reason of mankind is properly the rule of interpretation in both cases: and that common reason shines out the brightest, and appears in greatest perfection, in the united verdict of the wisest and most excellent men. It is much easier for one, or for some few fallible interpreters to be deceived, than for many, other circumstances supposed equal. Nothing less than very clear Scripture, or as clear reason, ought to weigh anything against the concurring sentiments of the Christian world: and even in such a case, some fair account ought to be given, how it came to pass, that such clear Scripture or clear reason had hitherto escaped the notice, or missed of the acceptance of the wisest and best of men.

A very judicious writer of our own has observed, that 'variety of judgments and opinions argueth obscurity in those things whereabout they differ; but that which all parts receive for truth, that which, every one having sifted, is by no one denied or doubted of, must needs be matter of infallible certainty [c].' This he applies to the general doctrine of the Holy Communion, as being 'instrumentally a cause of the real participation of Christ, and of life in his body and blood [d].' And it is of this that he says, 'that all sides at length, for aught he could see, were come to a general agreement: all approve and acknowledge to be most true, as having nothing in it but that which the words of Christ are on all sides confessed to enforce; nothing but that which the Church of God hath always thought necessary; nothing but that which alone is sufficient for every Christian man to believe concerning the use and force of this Sacrament: finally, nothing but that wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant, and all Christian confessions agreeable [e].' Thus wrote that excellent person in

[c] Hooker, b. v. p. 310. [d] Compare p. 306. [e] Page 306.

the year 1597. The Zuinglians by that time had corrected, or more clearly explained their principles: and Socinus was scarce yet known on this side the water, or had made no figure with respect to this subject, or none worth the mentioning, in opposition to a prescription of fifteen hundred years before him, and to the united voice of all the churches in his time. It is a maxim of prudence, as in all other matters, so also in the interpreting Scripture, to consult with the wise, and to take to our assistance the most eminent lights we can anywhere find, either among ancients or moderns. To be a little more particular, I may here observe something distinctly of each.

1. As to ancients, some lived in the very infancy of the Church, had personally known our blessed Lord in the flesh, or conversed with the Apostles, and afterwards governed their respective churches, as venerable bishops, many years, often administering the Holy Communion, and at length dying martyrs. Is it at all likely, that such men as they were should not understand the true Scripture doctrine concerning the Sacraments, or that they should affect to delude the people committed to their charge, with superstitious conceits, or fond expectations? A man must be of a very odd turn of mind, who can deliberately entertain so unworthy a thought of the apostolical Fathers, or can presume to imagine that he sees deeper into the use or force of those sacred institutions than those holy men did. It is reasonable to conceive, that the New Testament was penned with a very particular view to the capacities of the first readers or hearers; not only because it was natural to adapt the style to the then current language and customs, but also because much depended upon making the Gospel plain and intelligible to the first converts, above all that should come after. If the earliest Christians, after the Apostles, could not readily understand the religion then taught, how should it be handed down with advantage to others of later times? But if the Scripture doctrine should be supposed comparatively obscure to those that come after, yet so long as the earlier Christians found it perfectly clear, and left behind them useful memoirs whereby we may learn how they understood it, there will be sufficient security against any dangerous mistakes in succeeding ages, by looking back to the sense of the most early interpreters. Great regard therefore ought to be paid to the known sense and judgment of the apostolical Fathers[f]. The later Fathers, of the second, third, and fourth centuries, have their weight also, in proportion to their known integrity, and abilities, and fame in

[f] Of this see more in Abp. Wake's Apostolical Fathers, Introd. chap. x.

all the churches; and more especially in proportion to their early standing, their nearness to the fountain-head [g].

2. As to moderns of best note, they agree with the ancients in the main things, and may be usefully consulted on the present subject. Some of them have been eminently skilled in Jewish antiquities, and others in ecclesiastical. Some have excelled in criticism and the learned languages: others in clearness of conception and accuracy of judgment: all are useful in their several ways, and may suggest many things which upon due inquiry will be found to be right, and which no single writer, left to himself, and without consulting them, would ever have thought on. A man that affects to think by himself will often fancy he sees that in Scripture which is not there, and will overlook what there really is: he will run wide in his conjectures, criticize in a wrong place, and fall short in most things, for want of compass, and larger views, or for want of a due consideration of consequences here or there. Truth is of wide extent, and is all over uniform and consistent: and it may require many eyes to look out, and search round, that every position advanced may agree with all truths, natural and revealed, and that no heterogeneous mixture be admitted to deform and deface the whole system. How often does it happen, that a man pleases himself with a thought, which strikes him at first view, and which perhaps he looks upon as demonstration: and yet further inquiries into other men's labours may at length convince him that it is mere delusion, justly exploded by the more knowing and judicious. There are numberless instances of that kind to be met with among men of letters: which should make every writer cautious how he presumes too far upon his own unassisted abilities, and how he opposes his single judgment to the united verdict of wise, great, and good men. It requires commonly much pains and care to trace a notion quite through; to run it up to its first principles, and again to traverse it to its remotest consequences, and to clear it of all just objections, in order to be at length rationally satisfied, that it is sound and good, and consistent throughout. Different churches, or parties, have their different interpretations of the same texts, and their different superstructures built upon the same principles. They have respectively their several pleas, pretences, arguments, solutions, for the maintaining a debate either in the offensive or defensive way. A subject thus comes to be narrowly scanned, and minutely viewed on every side; and so at length a

[g] This argument is considered at large in my Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity Asserted, vol. iii. ch. vii. pp. 601—666.

consistent chain of truth may be wrought out, by a careful hand, from what the finest wits or ablest heads among the several contending parties have happily supplied.

But perhaps it may here be asked; Is then every man obliged to look deep into religious controversies? Are not the Scriptures alone sufficient for any plain and sincere Christian to conduct himself by, whether as to faith or manners? I answer: 1. Common Christians must be content to understand Scripture as they may, under the help of such guides as Providence has placed over them, and in the conscientious use of such means as are proper to their circumstances: which is all that ordinarily can be required of them. 2. Those who undertake to direct and guide them are more particularly obliged to search into religious controversies, and to 'prove all things' (as far as lies in their power) in order to lead others in the right way. 3. Those guides ought, in their inquiries or instructions, to pay a proper regard and deference to other guides of eminent note, ancient and modern, and not lightly to contradict them, or vary from them; remembering always, that themselves are fallible, and that new notions (in religion especially) are not comparable, generally speaking, to the old, proved, and tried. 4. If any man interpreting Scripture in a new sense, pretends that his doctrine at least is old, being Scripture doctrine; he should be told, that his interpretation however is new, and very suspicious, because new, and so not likely to be Scripture doctrine. The novelty of it is itself a strong presumption against it, and such as nothing can overbalance but very clear and plain reasons on that side. The judgment of ten thousand interpreters will always be of considerable weight against the judgment of some few, who are but interpreters at best, and as fallible as any other: and it must argue great conceitedness and self-sufficiency, for a man to expect to be heard, or attended to, as a scripturist, or a textuary, in opposition to the Christian world; unless he first fairly considers and confutes what the ablest writers have pleaded for the received construction, and next as fairly proves and enforces his own. That there is very great weight and force in the united voice of the Christian world, is a point not to be denied by any: and indeed those that affect to set up new notions are themselves aware of it, and tacitly, at least, confess the same thing. For they value such authorities as they are any way able to procure, or even to torture so far as to make them speak on their side: and they pride themselves highly in the number of their disciples, (as often as they chance to succeed,) thinking it a great advantage to their cause, if but

the multitude only, or the vulgar herd, approve and espouse the same thing with them. Socinus, for instance, while he slighted, or pretended to slight, the concurring judgment of all churches, ancient and modern, yet felt a very sensible pleasure in the applauses of some few individuals, whom he had been able to deceive: and he looked upon their approbation as a confirming circumstance that his sentiments were true and right. This kind of natural logic appears to be common to our whole species: and there are few, I believe, so sanguine, (unless disordered,) as to confide entirely in their own judgment, or not to suspect their own best reasonings, however plausible they may at first appear, if they have nobody else to concur with them and support them. Therefore again I conclude as before, that it is of great moment to know and consider what others have thought before us, and what the common reason of mankind approves: and the more numerous or the more considerable the persons were or are who stand against us in any article, the less reason, generally, have we to be confident of our own private persuasions.

I shall only add, that in subjects which have already passed through many hands, and which have been thoroughly sifted and considered by the ablest and best heads, in a course of seventeen hundred years, there appears to be a great deal more room for judgment than for invention; since little new can now be thought on that is worth notice: and it is much wiser and safer to take the most valuable observations of men most eminent in their several ways, than to advance poor things of our own, which perhaps are scarce worth the mentioning in comparison.

III. I must further premise, in relation to our present subject, that as there may be two extremes, viz. of superstition on one hand, and of profaneness on the other, it appears to be much safer and better to lean towards the former extreme, than to incline to the latter. Where there is room for doubt, it is prudent to err rather on that side which ascribes too much to the Sacrament, than on that which ascribes too little. 1. Because it is erring on the side of the precepts: for Scripture gives us express cautions[h] against paying too little regard to this holy Sacrament, but never cautions us at all, or however not expressly, against the contrary extreme. 2. Besides, since we attempt not, and desire not to carry the respect due to the Sacrament at all higher than the ancient churches, and the primitive saints and martyrs have carried the same before, it will be erring on the humble, modest, pious side, if we should happen to run into an extreme,

[h] 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.

after such bright examples. And this again is much safer (for who would not wish that his lot may be amongst the saints?) than it can be to deviate into the contrary extreme of irreverence, and to come so much the nearer to the faithless and unbelieving, who have their portion in this life.

It may be pleaded perhaps, that a person does no harm, or risks no danger, by erring on the lessening side, because God will certainly perform what he has really promised of the Sacraments to every worthy receiver, whether believed or no. But then the question is, how a man can be thought a worthy receiver, who, without sufficient grounds, disbelieves the promises, much more if he confidently rejects them, and teaches others also to do so. Schlictingius pleads in this case, that the effect of the Sacrament will be the same to every one that receives, though he disbelieves the doctrine of its being a mean of grace[1], or the like: as if he thought that the outward act of receiving were all, and that the inward qualification of faith were of no moment. But that was his great mistake. They who disbelieve and openly deny the inward graces of the Sacrament are unworthy receivers for that very reason, and ordinarily forfeit all right and title to the promised graces.

It may be further pleaded, on the same side, that the notion of the Sacraments, as means of grace, (supposing it erroneous,) is apt to lead men to rely upon the Sacraments more than upon their own serious endeavours for the leading a good life, or to rest in the Sacraments as sufficient without keeping God's commandments. But this is a suggestion built upon no certain grounds. For suppose we were deceived (as we certainly are not) in our high conceptions of the use and efficacy of this Sacrament; all that follows is, that we may be thereby led to frequent the Sacrament so much the oftener; to come to it with the greater reverence, and to repeat our solemn vows for the leading a good life, by the assistance of Divine grace, with the more serious and devout affections. No divines amongst us,

[1] 'Articulus de coena Domini et baptismo (si vera est vestra sententia, qua coenam Domini et baptismum media esse statuitis per quae Deus spirituales effectus in animis hominum operetur) exprimit quidem causam salutis instrumentalem: sed tamen ignoratus aut repudiatus salutem non adimit, dummodo quispiam coena Domini et baptismo utatur; adhibitis enim istis divinitus ordinatis instrumentis effectum sequi necesse est.' Schlicting. adv. Balthas. Meisn. p. 6. Conf. Socin. de Coena, tom. i. p. 767.

To which Abr. Calovius well answers: 'Negare nos, sacramenta talia media esse quae illico effectus sequatur, etiamsi fides non accedat: fides autem locum habere nequit in iis qui negant et impugnant directe media salutis divinitus instituta.' Abr. Calov. contr. Socin. tom. i. part 2. p. 251.

that I know of, ever teach that the use of the outward Sacrament is of any avail without inward faith and repentance, or entire obedience. Our Church at least, and, I think, all Protestant churches, have abundantly guarded against any one's resting in the bare outward work. The danger therefore on this side is very slight in comparison. For what if a man should erroneously suppose that upon his worthy receiving he obtains pardon for past sins, and grace to prevent future, will not this be an encouragement to true repentance, without which he can be no worthy receiver, and to watchfulness also for the time to come, without which the Divine grace can never have its perfect work? Not that I would plead for any pious mistake, (were it really a mistake,) but I am answering an objection; and shewing, that there is no comparative force in it. Were the persuasion I am pleading for really an error, reason good that it should be discarded: religion wants not the assistance of pious frauds, neither can it be served by them. But as we are now supposing it doubtful on which side the error lies, and are arguing only upon that supposition, it appears to be a very clear case, that religion would suffer abundantly more by an error on the left hand, than by an error on the right; and that of the two extremes, profaneness, rather than superstition, is the dangerous extreme.

Add to this, that corrupt nature generally leans to the diminishing side, and is more apt to detract from the burden of religion than to increase the weight; and therefore the stronger guard ought to be placed there. Men are but too inclinable of themselves to take up with low and grovelling sentiments of Divine things: and so there is the less need of bending Scripture that way, when the words are fairly capable of an higher meaning, yea, and require it also, as shall be shewn in the sequel.

If it should be asked, what temptation any serious Christian can have to lessen the promises or privileges belonging to the Sacraments? I answer, that pure good-nature and mistaken humanity may often tempt men to be as easy and indulgent as possible, in their casuistry, for the relieving of tender consciences, and for the quieting the scruples of their brethren. The guides of souls are sometimes apt to be over-officious that way, and much more than is proper; like as indulgent parents often ruin their children by an excessive fondness, considering their present uneasiness more than their future well-being. When Epicurus set himself to take off the restraints of religion, no doubt but he thought he was doing the most humane and the best-natured

3 1833 04481 9537

office imaginable. It had the appearance of it, in some respects, (though upon the whole it was altogether the reverse,) and that was his chief temptation to it. It is not improbable that the same kind of good-nature, ill directed, has tempted many otherwise learned and valuable guides to be too indulgent casuists, and to comply too far with the humour of the world. Strict notions of the Sacraments require as strict observance of the same Sacraments, which demands the more intense care, and greater abstraction of thought; all which is irksome and painful to flesh and blood: there lies the temptation to low and diminishing conceptions of the Sacraments, both in clergy and people.

But are there not temptations likewise to an over-scrupulous severity? Undoubtedly there are. Sometimes education, temper, prejudice; sometimes indiscreet zeal, or a spice of enthusiasm: but in the general, and for the most part, the making religion bend to the humours and fashions of the world is the sin which most easily besets us; and therefore there it is that we ought to appoint the double guard. To conclude this article, all extremes are wrong, and it may require some care and good discernment to observe in every instance the golden mean: but still there may be greater sin and danger on one side than on the other; and I have thought it of some moment to determine thus briefly, to which of the extremes we may, in our circumstances, most securely and wisely lean.

IV. There is another consideration very proper to be hinted here in the entrance, relating to the prejudice often done to our venerable Sacraments, by representing them under the detracting or diminishing name of positive duties: as if they were to be considered as duties only, rather than religious rites in which God bears a part; or as if that part which belongs to us, and is really duty, were a single duty, and not rather a band and cement of all duties, or a kind of sponsion and security for the present and future performance of the whole duty of man. How this matter stands will be seen distinctly in the sequel. But it is proper to hint something of it here beforehand, lest the reader, by attending to a false light, should set out under a mistake of the main question. Let it be previously understood, what it is that we assert and maintain, for the removing of prejudices, and for the preventing any wrong suspicion, either of our exalting a bare external duty above faith, hope, and charity, or of our recommending any single duty in derogation to the rest.

1. In the first place therefore, let it be carefully noted, that it is not merely a duty of ours, but a sacred rite, (in which God

himself bears a part,) that we are labouring to exalt, or rather to do justice to. The doctrine of our Church, and of all Christian churches, early and late, is much the same with what our Homilies teach us: namely, that 'in the Sacraments God embraces us, and offereth himself to be embraced by us;' and that they 'set out to the eyes, and other outward senses, the inward workings of God's free mercy, and seal in our hearts the promises of God[k].

A learned writer observes and proves, that a sacrament relates to that which 'flows from God to us;' and he adds, that 'it is a thing neither denied nor forgotten by any, but is evident from what the Scriptures teach concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper[l].' Indeed, the Socinian way is to exclude God, as it were, out of the Sacraments, and to allow him no part in them, but to reduce all to a bare human performance, or positive duty: but we have not so learned Christ. We are so far from thinking the sacramental transaction to be a bare duty of ours, that we conceive there is great use and efficacy in a sacrament, even where the recipient performs no duty at all, nor is capable of any, as in the case of infants receiving Baptism. It is further observable, that Baptism is frequently mentioned together with repentance, in the New Testament, as distinct from it; though repentance alone, as it signifies or implies entire obedience, fully expresses all that is properly and merely duty on our part. A plain sign that Baptism, as a sacrament, carries more in the idea of it than the consideration of bare duty, and that it comes not, in its whole notion, under the head of duties, but of rites, or contracts, or covenants, solemn transactions between God and man. God bears his part in it, as well as we ours: and therefore it is looked upon as distinct from bare duties, and spoken of accordingly.

I suppose it might be on these and the like considerations, that some Divines have conceived, that a sacrament, properly, is rather an application of God to men, than of men to God. Mr. Scandret, distinguishing a sacrament, according to its precise formality, from a sacrifice, observes, that it is 'an outward visible sign of an invisible grace or favour from God to man[m].'

[k] Homily on the Common Prayer and Sacraments.

[l] Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 12. Vossius, to the same purpose, says: 'Quemadmodum fides est quasi manus nostra, qua nos quaerimus et accipimus: sic verbum et sacramenta esse quasi manus Dei quibus is nobis offert et confert quod a fide nobis petitur et accipitur.' Voss. de Sacram. Vi et Effic. p. 252. vol. vi. Opp.

[m] Scandret, Sacrifice of the Divine Service, p. 54.

And Dr. Rymer takes notice, that, according to our Church Catechism, 'a sacrament is not supposed, in its most essential part, an application made by men to God, but one made by God to man .... A gracious condescension of God's, by which he converses with men, and exhibits to them spiritual blessings, &c....God's part is indeed the whole that is strictly and properly sacramental: the outward and visible signs exhibited are in effect the voice of God, repeating his promise of that inward and spiritual favour[n].' Dr. Towerson long before had observed, that there is a difficulty as to 'shewing that a sacrament relates equally to that which passeth from us to God, and that it imports our duty and service[o].' He conceived no difficulty at all, as to God's part in a sacrament; that was a clear point: but he thought it not so easy to prove, that the strict and proper sense of the word sacrament includes man's part at all. However, it is very certain that the whole transaction, in the case of adults, is between two parties, and that the application is mutual between God and man. And this must be acknowledged particularly in the Eucharist, by as many as do allow of a Consecration-prayer, and do admit that service to be part of our religious worship, as also to be a federal rite. But from hence may appear how widely they mistake who consider a sacrament as a bare human performance, a discharge of a positive duty on man's part, and nothing more, throwing out what belongs to God, and what is most strictly sacramental. It is sinking or dropping the noblest and most essential part of the idea, and presenting us with a very lame and insufficient account of the thing. But a more minute explication of this matter, together with the proofs of what we maintain, will come in hereafter: all I intended here was only to give the reader some previous conception of the state of the main question, that he may understand the more clearly what we are about.

2. Next, I must observe, that that part in a sacrament which is really ours, and which, so far as concerns adults, is properly duty, is yet such a duty as is supposed to comprehend, one way or other, all duty: for receiving worthily (as shall be shewn in its place) implies present repentance, a heart turned to God and to universal obedience, and a serious resolution so to abide to our life's end. It has been thought somewhat strange, by those who have imbibed wrong notions of the case, that all Christian privileges should be supposed to follow a single duty,

[n] Rymer, General Representation of Revealed Religion, pp. 286, 287.
[o] Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 12.

when they really belong to the whole system of duties. But when it is considered, that these privileges are never conceived to be annexed to this single duty, in any other view, or upon any other supposition, but as it virtually carries in it (or in the idea of worthy reception) all duty, the main difficulty will vanish; for it may still be true, that those Christian privileges go along with the whole system of duties, and with nothing short of it. We never do annex all Christian privileges to this single duty, but as this duty is conceived, for the time being, to contain all the rest; for that we take to be implied in receiving worthily. Whether we are right in interpreting worthy reception in so comprehensive a sense, is not now the question, but may be considered in its place: all I am concerned with here is to ward off a charge of inconsistency, with respect to our doctrine on this head.

But to shew the weakness of the charge yet more plainly, let the same objection be urged in a very common case of oaths to a government, or of subscription to articles, to which many State-privileges and Church-privileges are ordinarily annexed. What, may some say, shall all those privileges be given, merely for the labour of repeating an oath, or of writing a name? No, certainly: the outward work is the least and the lowest part of what the privileges are intended for, if it be any part at all, in a strict sense. The privileges are intended for persons so swearing, or so subscribing, upon a presumption that such oath carries in it all dutiful allegiance to the sovereign, and that such subscription carries in it all conformity in faith and doctrine to the Church established. Of the like nature and use are our sacramental ties and covenants. They are supposed, when worthily performed, to carry in them all dutiful allegiance to God, and a firm attachment to Christ; a stipulation of a good conscience, and, in a word, universal righteousness, both as to faith and manners[p]: all which is solemnly entered into for the present, and stipulated for the future, by every sincere and devout communicant. To be short, repentance, rightly understood, and a due attendance on the Sacraments, taken

[p] What Tertullian observes of the sacrament of Baptism is justly applicable to both Sacraments: 'Lavacrum illud obsignatio est fidei, quae fides a poenitentiae fide incipitur et commendatur. Non ideo abluimur ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus, quoniam jam corde loti sumus. Haec enim prima audientis intinctio est, metus integer, deinde quoad Dominum senseris, fides sana, conscientia semel poenitentiam amplexata. Ceterum, si ab aquis peccare desistimus, necessitate, non sponte innocentiam induimus.' Tertull. de Poenit. cap. vi. p. 125. Rigalt.

together, do in our account make up the whole system of Christian practice for the time being: therefore in annexing all Gospel-privileges to worthy receiving, we do not annex them to one duty only, but to all, contained, as it were, or summed up (by the supposition) in that one. All the mistake and misconception which some run into on this head, appears to be owing to their abstracting the outward work from the inward worthiness supposed to go along with it, and then calling that a single duty, which at best is but the shell of duty in itself, and which, in some circumstances, (as when separate from a good heart,) is no duty at all, but a grievous sin, a contempt offered to the body and blood of Christ, and highly provoking to Almighty God.

Thus far I have taken the liberty of premising a few things in the entrance; not for the anticipating what I am hereafter to prove, but for the removing those prejudices which appeared to lie in the way. And now I proceed, with God's assistance, to what I intend upon the subject of the Eucharist, otherwise styled the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Communion.

CHAP. I.

Of the most noted or most considerable Names under which the Holy Communion hath been anciently spoken of.

BEFORE I come directly to treat of the thing, it may be proper to observe something of the names it has anciently gone under: which I shall endeavour to range in chronological order, according to the time when each name may be supposed to have come up, or first to have grown into vogue.

A.D. 33. *Breaking of Bread.*

The oldest name given to this holy ceremony, or religious service, seems to have been that of 'breaking bread,' taken from what the disciples saw done by our Lord in the solemnity of the institution. I choose to set the date according to the time of the first clear instance[a] we have of it, rather than according to the time when St. Luke related it in his history; because very probably he followed the style of those who then celebrated it. St. Luke in his history of the Acts, speaking of the disciples, says: 'They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers[b].' The circumstances of the text plead strongly for interpreting it of the Holy Communion: and the Syriac version (which is of great antiquity) renders it 'breaking of the Eucharist[c];' which is some confirmation of the same construction. A little lower, in the same chapter,

[a] I said, first clear instance; because though Luke xxiv. 30, 35 has been understood of the Eucharist by some ancients, and more moderns, (Romanists especially,) and I see no absurdity in the interpretation, nor anything highly improbable, or that could give just advantage to the Romish cause with respect to communion in one kind; yet since it is a disputed construction, and such as cannot be ascertained, I call that instance not clear, but pass it off as none, because it is doubtful.

[b] Acts ii. 42.

[c] The same phrase occurs in the Recognitions, lib. vi. n. 15: 'Eucharistiam frangens cum eis.'

mention is again made of the disciples, as 'continuing daily in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house[d];' or rather 'in a house,' set apart for holy uses[e].

St. Luke a third time takes notice of the 'breaking of bread:' where also the Syriac version renders as before, 'breaking of the Eucharist.' The circumstances confirm it: it was on the 'first day of the week,' and St. Paul is observed to have 'preached unto them.' St. Paul also himself seems to allude to this name, when speaking of this Sacrament he says, 'The bread which we break, is it not the Communion[f]?' &c. They who would see more concerning this name may consult, besides commentators, the authors referred to at the bottom of the page[g]. I may just observe, by the way, that scruples have been raised against the construction here given; and some have thought that the texts might possibly be interpreted either of a love-feast, or else of a common meal. I think, very hardly, and not without some violence. However, even Whitby and Wolfius, who appear to hesitate upon Acts ii. 42, 46, yet are positive enough with respect to Acts xx. 7, as relating to the Eucharist: and since there is no ground for scruple, excepting only that the Romanists make an ill use of this construction, and that may easily be obviated a better way[h], I look upon the construction here given as sufficiently supported. And it is some confirmation of it, that Ignatius, of the apostolical times, makes use of the same phrase of 'breaking bread,' where he is plainly speaking of this holy Sacrament[i].

[d] Acts ii. 46. Our translation in the phrase 'from house to house' (*κατ' οἶκον*) follows Beza, who renders 'domatim,' and has been found fault with by Scaliger, Mede, Beveridge, and Cave, referred to in Wolfius Cur. Crit. pag. 1048. Compare Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, vol. ii. p. 98.

[e] 'Erant autem privata illa *ὑπερῷα* loca a Judaeis semper sacris usibus destinata; saltem ex quo Daniel propheta ascendisse in coenaculum ad orandum diceretur.' Pearson, Lect. in Act. Apost. p. 31.

[f] 1 Cor. x. 16.

[g] Casaubon. ad Annal. Eccles. Exerc. xvi. p. 378, alias p. 528. Buxtorf. de Coena Domini, pp. 312, 313. Suicer. Thesaur. in voc. *κλάσις*, p. 105. Johan. Vorstii Philolog. Sacr. part. ii. p. 200. Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 166.

[h] Vid. Casaubon. ad Annal. Eccl. Exercit. xvi. n. 48. p. 379.

[i] *Ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες.* Ignat. ad Ephes. cap. xx. p. 19.

A. D. 57. *Communion.* Κοινωνία.

The name of Communion has been long famous, and was undoubtedly taken from St. Paul's account of this Sacrament, where he teaches that the effect of this service is the Communion of the body and blood of Christ [k]. He does not indeed directly call the Sacrament by that name, as others have done since; he was signifying what the thing is, or what it does, rather than how it was then called [l]. But as his account gave the first occasion for the name of Communion, I thought it not amiss to date it from thence. I find not that this name became frequent in the earlier centuries: the Canons called apostolical are of doubtful age. The Roman clergy, in a letter to the clergy of Carthage, make use of the name Communion in the time of St. Cyprian [m], that is, about the middle of the third century. But in the age next following, it became very common, both in the Greek and Latin Fathers. The Spanish Fathers, in the Council of Elvira, (A.D. 305), make use of it more than forty times: the Councils of Arles and of Ancyra (in 314 and 315) made use of the same. The Council of Nice, in the year 325, speaks of the same Sacrament under the name of Communion [n], in their thirteenth Canon. Hilary, about the middle of the same century, styles it sometimes the Communion of the Holy Body, sometimes the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, sometimes the Communion of the everlasting Sacraments [o]. A little later in the same century, Basil sometimes has the single word Communion [p] to denote the Eucharist: at other times he calls it the Communion of the good Thing, or of

[k] 1 Cor. x. 16.

[l] 'Non appellat Paulus Coenam Domini Communionem tanquam proprio ejus nomine; sed vim et efficaciam Sacramenti hujus exprimens, ait eam esse communionem, sive participationem corporis Christi.' Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. n. 47. p. 361.

[m] 'Si qui in hanc tentationem inciderunt, coeperint apprehendi infirmitate, et agant poenitentiam facti sui, et desiderent communionem, utique subveniri eis debet' &c. Apud Cyprian. Epist. ii. p. 8. Bened. ed.

[n] Κοινωνίας πάλιν τυχών. Concil. Nicaen. can. xiii. p. 330. Harduin.

[o] Hilarius Pictavens. pp. 169, 223, 740. edit. Bened.

[p] Κοινωνίαν οἶκοι κατέχοντες, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν. ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ δὲ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τελούντων, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅτε βούλεται μεταλαμβάνει δι' ἑαυτοῦ. Basil. Epist xciii. p. 187. edit. Bened.; alias Epist. 289.

the Sovereign Good[q]. I need not descend to lower Fathers, amongst whom the name became very frequent: Suicer[r] has collected their testimonies, observing withal the several accounts which they gave of the name, all reducible to three. 1. The Sacrament is so called because of the communion we therein hold with Christ and with each other. 2. Because we are therein made partners of Christ's kingdom. 3. Because it is a religious banquet, which we partake of in common with our fellow Christians.

A.D. 57. *Lord's Supper.*

I am willing to set down the name of Lord's Supper as a Scripture name, occurring in St. Paul's Epistles[s]; which appears to be the most prevailing opinion of learned Protestants. Not that I take it to be a clear point at all, or so much as capable of being proved: but I incline rather to those, both ancients and moderns, who interpret that place of the love-feast, kept in imitation of our Lord's Last Supper, which was previous to the original Eucharist. Thus much however is certain, that in the apostolical times the love-feast and the Eucharist, though distinct, went together, and were nearly allied to each other, and were both of them celebrated at one meeting. Without some such supposition as that, it was next to impossible to account for St. Paul's quick transition, in that chapter, from one to the other. Whether, therefore, Lord's Supper in that chapter signifies the love-feast only, or the Eucharist only, or both together, one thing is clear and unquestionable, that they were both but different parts of the same solemnity, or different acts of the same meeting: and there is no occasion to be scrupulously nice and critical in distinguishing to which of the parts the name strictly belongs[t].

[q] Κοινωνία τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Epist. Canon. prima ad Amphiloch. p. 272. Epist. secunda, p. 293.

[r] Suicer. Thesaur. in Κοινωνία. Conf. Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. n. 47. p. 361, &c., alias 504, &c.

[s] 1 Cor. xi. 20.

[t] 'Quid rei sit coena haec, accuratius inquirere non est opus: sive enim Christianorum Agapae, sive ipsa Eucharistia significetur, nil interest, dummodo concedatur (quod nulla prorsus ratione negari potest) Eucharistiae celebrationem cum Agapis esse conjunctam.' Sam. Basnag. Annal. tom. ii. p. 296.

Maldonate, the Jesuit, in his Contents upon Matt. xxvi. 26, took upon him to reproach the Protestants in an unhandsome manner, for speaking of the Eucharist under the name of a Supper; which he thought irreverent, and not warranted by Scripture, antiquity, or sound reason[u]. The learned Casaubon some time after appeared in behalf of the Protestants[x], and easily defended them, as to the main thing, against the injurious charge. Albertinus, long after, searched with all diligence into ancient precedents and authorities for the name, and produced them in great abundance[y], more than sufficient to confute the charge of novelty, rashness, or profaneness on that head. The truth of the matter seems to be, that though there is no clear proof that the name of Supper is a Scripture name, yet some Fathers (as high as the fourth century) thought that it was, so understanding 1 Cor. xi. 20. And many interpreters of good note have followed them in it. Indeed it does not appear that the text was so construed before the latter end of the fourth century, or that the name of Lord's Supper was much in use as a name for the Eucharist. Irenaeus once has the name of God's Supper, but means quite another thing by it[z]. Tertullian has the same[a] for Lord's Table, referring to 1 Cor. x. 21, not to 1 Cor. xi. 20. He has also the phrase of Lord's Banquet[b], [or Lord's Day Banquet,] and Banquet of God[c], meaning the love-feasts then in use, which he elsewhere styles the Supper of Christians[d]. But St. Basil very plainly interprets Lord's Supper in that text of the Eucharist[e]: which even Fronto Ducaeus, in

[u] 'Calvinistae sine Scripturae auctoritate, sine veterum auctorum exemplo, sine ratione, nullo judicio, coenam vocant.' Maldonat. p. 556.

[x] Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. n. 32. p. 368, alias 513.

[y] Albertinus de Eucharistia, lib. i. cap. 1.

[z] 'Coena Dei.' Iren. lib. iv. cap. 36. p. 279. ed. Bened.

[a] 'Non possumus coenam Dei edere, et coenam daemoniorum.' Tertullian. de Spect. cap. xiii. p. 79.

[b] 'Convivium Dominicum.' Tertull. ad Uxor. cap. iv. p. 168.

[c] 'Convivium Dei.' Tertull. de Virgin. Vel. cap. viii. p. 172.

[d] 'Coena nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit: id vocatur quod dilectio apud Graecos.' Tertull. Apoll. cap. 39.

[e] "Ωσπερ οὐδὲν κοινὸν σκεῦος ἐπιτρέπει ὁ λόγος εἰσφέρεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια, οὕτως οὐδὲ τὰ ἅγια εἰς κοινὸν οἶκον ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. . . . μήτε τὸν κοινὸν δεῖπνον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, μήτε τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐν οἰκίᾳ καθυβρίζειν. Basil. Regul. Brev. p. 310, p. 525. ed. Bened., alias 657. Conf. Theodorit. in 1 Cor. xi. 20.

his notes upon the place, confesses; endeavouring at the same time to bring off Maldonate as fairly as the matter would bear, while, in reality, he yields the main thing, with respect to the Fathers, at least. However, it must be owned that Basil is the first who directly so interprets the text, and that the Fathers were not all of a mind about it, and that the appellation of Supper was not very common till after the fourth century; and that even in the later centuries the name of Lord's Supper was a name for that supper which our Lord made previous to the Eucharist. The third Council of Carthage (A.D. 418) speaks of 'one day in the year in which the Lord's Supper was celebrated[f]:' where it is plain that Lord's Supper does not mean the Eucharist, but the supper proper to Maundy-Thursday, kept in imitation of our Lord's Paschal Supper, previous to the Eucharist. And the like is mentioned in the Trullan Council (A.D. 683), in their 29th Canon[g]. So that Lord's Supper was not then become a familiar name, as now, for the Eucharist, but rather eminently denoted the supper previous to it; either our Lord's own, or that which was afterwards observed by Christians as a memorial of it, being a kind of love-feast. I shall only add further, that Hilary the Deacon (A.D. 380, or nearly) in his comment upon 1 Cor. xi. seems to dislike the name of supper[h], as applied to the Eucharist, and therefore could not interpret the text as Basil of that time did.

A.D. 96. *Oblation.* Προσφορά.

The name of oblation may, I think, be fairly carried up as high as to Clemens of Rome, who upon the lowest computation wrote his famous Epistle as early as the year 96. The more common date is 70, or thereabout: but a learned and considerate writer[i], who very lately has re-examined the chronology of that Epistle, has with great appearance of probability brought it down to A.D. 96: and there I am willing to rest it.

[f] Μιᾶς ἐτησίας ἡμέρας ἐν ᾗ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐπιτελεῖται. Concil. Carthag. Can. xliv. p. 567. Bevereg. edit.

[g] Μιᾶς ἐτησίου ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐπιτελεῖται. Concil. Trull. Can. xxix. p. 188.

[h] 'Ostendit [Christus] illis mysterium Eucharistiae inter coenandum celebratum, non coenam esse: medicina enim spiritualis est, quae cum reverentia degustata, purificat sibi devotum.' Pseud. Ambros. in loc.

[i] Lardner, Credibility of Gospel Hist. part ii. vol. i. pp. 50—62.

Clemens speaks of the oblations and sacred functions of the Church, referring, very probably, to the Eucharistical service [k]: neither can he without some violence be interpreted to mean anything else. In another place, he still more plainly refers to the same, where he says: 'It would be no small sin in us, should we cast off those from the episcopal function, who holily and without blame offer the gifts [l].' Here he expressly speaks of gifts offered, (that is, of oblation,) and by sacerdotal hands. The gifts were brought to the altar, or communion table, by the people, and were recommended to God's acceptance by the officiating bishop, or presbyter. So there was first a kind of lay oblation, and next a sacerdotal oblation of the same gifts to God. Those gifts consisted partly of alms to the poor, and partly of oblations, properly so called, to the Church; and out of these last was usually taken the matter of the Eucharist, the bread and wine [m]. The oblation, as I before hinted, was twofold; hence the whole service of the Eucharist came to be called the oblation: and to communicate, or to administer, in Church language, was to offer. There was a third kind of oblation [n] which came up afterwards, in the third century: or, to speak more accurately, the commemoration, which was always a part of the Eucharistical service, came by degrees to be called an oblation, (but not within the two first centuries, so far as I can find,) and then commenced a kind of third oblation: not a new thing, but an old service under a new name.

[k] Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν . . . τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργείας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι . . . οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτοί εἰσι καὶ μακάριοι. Clem. Rom. Ep. c. xl. p. 164. edit. Cant.

Vitringa, upon these words, allows that they refer to the Eucharist. 'Preces haud dubie intelliguntur cum sacris Eucharistiae, quibus Clemens statas horas, ad exemplum sacrorum templi, definiri vult.' Vitring. de Vet. Synag. p. 1115. Conf. Basnag. Annal. vol. i. p. 371.

[l] 'Αμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. c. xliv. p. 178. Compare Johnson's Unbl. Sacrifice, part i. pp. 75, 78, &c.

[m] See Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. b. xv. ch. 2. sect. 1, 2. Deylingius, Observ. Miscellan. p. 301. Constitut. Apostol. lib. viii. c. 27, 30. L'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part i. ch. iv. p. 30, &c.

[n] Of the third oblation, or threefold oblation, see L'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part i. c. 8. Sam. Basnag. Annal. tom. i. p. 371. Pfaffius, Dissert. de Oblat. Vet. Eucharist. pp. 283, 293.

Justin Martyr, though he does not directly call the Eucharist by the name of oblation, yet he does obliquely, where he says that the oblation of fine flour, under the law, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist [o]; and where he speaks of the Eucharistical elements as being offered to God [p]. Elsewhere he speaks plainly of the lay offering, brought by the people to the administrator [q]: and I presume he is to be understood of an offering to be presented to God, by the hands of the Minister, brought to the Minister in order to be recommended by him to the Divine acceptance.

Irenaeus, of the same century, makes frequent mention of the oblation of the Eucharist, understanding by it the whole service as performed by clergy and people, according to their respective parts or provinces [r]. He supposes the oblation made to God, made by the Church, in and by the proper officers: and though the oblation strictly speaking, according to its primary signification, means only one part of the service, or two (viz. the people's bringing their offerings to the altar, and the administrator's presenting the same to God), yet from this part or parts of the service, the whole solemnity took the name of the oblation at that time, and such name became very common and familiar afterwards. For since the very matter of the Eucharist was taken out of the oblations received from the people, and solemnly offered up afterwards to God by the Ministers, it was very natural to give the name of oblation to the whole solemnity.

Tertullian speaking of the Devil, as imitating the mysteries of

o Ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορὰ . . . τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας. Just. Dial. p. 119 Jebb, 220 Thirlby.

p Προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας. Just. Dial. p. 120 Jebb, alias 220.

q Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ &c.

Ἄρτος προσφέρεται, καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ. καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν. Just. Mart. Apol. i. pp. 96, 98.

r 'Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis praestat, primitias suorum munerum' &c. Iren. lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249. edit. Bened. 'Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium repertum est' &c. 'Non genus oblationum reprobatum est: oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic.' p. 250. 'Hanc oblationem Ecclesia solam puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione, ex creatura ejus.' p. 251.

the Church, takes notice, among other things, of his instructing his votaries to baptize and to celebrate the oblation of bread[s]: as much as to say, that they also had their Eucharist in their way; oblation being here the name for the whole service. In another place he uses the single word 'offer,' for the whole action of administering and receiving the Communion[t]. Elsewhere he makes mention of oblations for the dead; and at the anniversaries of the martyrs[u]: and by oblations he could intend nothing but the Eucharistical solemnities celebrated on those days[x].

We have seen proofs sufficient of the name of oblation for the two first centuries. But it is observable, that all this time we meet only with oblation of gifts, or first fruits, or of bread, wine, or the like: no oblation of Christ's body, or blood, or of Christ absolutely, as we shall find afterwards. Hence it is, that some very learned men have thought that, according to the ancients, the oblation was considered always as previous to consecration, and that the elements were offered in order to be consecrated[y]: which indeed is true according to that sense of oblation which obtained for two centuries and a half; but a new sense, or new application of the word, or name, came in soon after, and so it will here be necessary to distinguish times.

I shall now pass on to Cyprian, to shew how this matter stood, upon the change of language introduced in his time. We shall find him plainly speaking of the offering Christ's body and blood[z].

[s] 'Tinguit et ipse quosdam .... celebrat et panis oblationem.' Tertull. de Praescript. c. xl. p. 216.

[t] 'Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus.' Tertull. de Exhort. Cast. c. vii. p. 522. Conf. de Veland. Virg. c. ix. p. 178.

[u] 'Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus.' Tertull. de Coron. c. iii. p. 102. Conf. de Exhort. Cast. c. xi. p. 523.

[x] See Bingham, book xxiii. ch. 3. sect. 12, 13. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 95.

[y] 'It is manifest, that it is called an oblation, or sacrifice, in all liturgies, according to the style of the most ancient Church-writers, not as consecrated, but as presented, and offered (whether by the people, as the custom was, to him that ministered, or by him that ministered, to God) to be consecrated.' Thorndike, Relig. Assembl. p. 379. 'Consecrationi autem oblationem praepositam olim fuisse, adeo perspicuum ex veterum dictis, liturgiisque antiquissimis, maxime Graecis, esse arbitramur, ut nihil clarius esse possit.' Pfaff. Fragm. Iren. in praefat.

[z] 'Obtulit [Dominus] hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.' Cyprian. Ep. lxiii. p. 105. edit. Bened. 'Unde

This must be understood of an oblation subsequent to consecration, not in order to it: for Christ's body and blood, whether real or symbolical, are holy, and could want no sanctification or consecration. He further seems to speak of offering Christ himself[a], in this Sacrament, unto God, but under the symbols of consecrated bread and wine. That may be his meaning: and the meaning is good, when rightly apprehended; for there was nothing new in it but the language, or the manner of expression. What the elder Fathers would have called, and did call, the commemorating of Christ, or the commemorating his passion, his body broken, or blood shed; that Cyprian calls the offering of Christ, or of his passion, &c., because, in a large sense, even commemorating is offering, as it is presenting the thing or the person so commemorated, in the way of prayer and thanksgiving, before God. I do not invent this account for the clearing a difficulty, but I take it from Cyprian himself, whose own words shew that the Eucharistical commemoration was all the while in his mind[b], and that that was all he meant by the oblation which he there speaks of, using a new name for an old thing. I shall shew in due time, that the later Fathers who followed Cyprian's language in this particular, and who admitted this third oblation (as some have called it) as well as he, yet when they came to explain, interpreted it to mean no more than a solemn commemoration, such as I have mentioned.

I must further observe, that though Cyprian sometimes advances this new kind of language, yet elsewhere he follows the more ancient way of speaking, and understands oblation as other

apparet sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici' &c. p. 107.

[a] 'Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem praecepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.' Ibid. p. 109. 'Quia passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus (passio est enim Domini, sacrificium quod offerimus) nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit, facere debemus.' p. 109.

[b] 'Calix qui in commemorationem [alias, commemoratione] ejus offertur.' p. 104. 'Quotiescunque ergo calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis ejus offerimus, id quod constat Dominum fecisse, faciamus.' p. 109.

Fathers before him had done. Thus, when he speaks of the sacrifice offered in the Eucharist by the poor [c], he means it of the lay oblation which was previous to consecration; as also when he speaks of the clergy's presenting the oblations of the people [d], he is to be understood of the first and second oblations, both of them previous to consecration. And when he observes, that an oblation cannot be sanctified where the Spirit is not given [e], he uses the word oblation for what was antecedent; and it amounts to the same as if he had said, that such an oblation could not be consecrated, could not be made the body and blood of Christ. But enough hath been said of the name of oblation in this place: the thing will be more distinctly considered hereafter.

A.D. 104. *Sacrament.*

The name of Sacrament, as applied to the Eucharist, though no Scripture name, yet certainly is of great antiquity. The younger Pliny, in his Letter to the Emperor Trajan, will afford us a good argument of it, in what he reports of the Christians, and from the Christians, as meeting on a certain day (the Lord's Day) and binding themselves by a 'Sacrament' to commit no wickedness, but to lead good lives [f]. As Pliny there reported what the Christians had told him, it is reasonable to judge, that they had made use of the word Sacrament to him, which they understood in the Christian sense, however Pliny or Trajan might take it: and so this testimony will amount to a probable proof of the use of the name of Sacrament among the Christians of that time. That the name, as there used, is to be understood

[c] 'Partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulerit, sumis.' Cypr. de Op. et Eleëm. p. 242.

[d] 'Qui communicando cum lapsis, et offerendo oblationes eorum' &c. Ep. xxviii. p. 38.

[e] 'Nec oblatio illic sanctificari possit, ubi Spiritus Sanctus non est.' Ep. lxiv. p. 112.

[f] 'Adfirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae, vel erroris, quod essent soliti, stato die, ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium.' Plin. Epist. xcvii. lib. x. p. 819. ed. Amstel. Conf. Tertullian. Apol. c. ii. pp. 24, 25. Lugd.

of the Eucharist, is a very clear case, from all the circumstances of the account. I know not how a late learned and judicious writer came to understand it of the Sacrament of Baptism [g]. The generality of the best learned men [h] interpret it of the Eucharist, and with very good reason: for the account refers to what the whole assembly were wont to do, at the same time; they could not all come to receive Baptism, though they might to receive the Eucharist. Then the mention of the Sacrament, as taken in the 'antelucan' meetings, tallies exactly with Tertullian's account of the Eucharist, as we shall see presently: besides that the hint given of the love-feast, as following soon after, confirms the same thing [i].

I go on then to Tertullian, who makes express mention of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as received in his time, but with some difference, as to the circumstances, from the original Eucharist of our Lord's own celebrating [k]. For that (he observes) was after supper, this before daylight, fasting: in that, the company helped one another, or every man took his part from the table [l]; in this, the Bishop or Presbyter in person gave the bread and cup to each communicant. But what I have principally to take notice of here is the use of the phrase, Sacrament of the Eucharist, conformable to the like phrases, which the same author makes use of to denote Baptism, calling it the Sacrament of water [m], and Sacrament of sanctification [n]. In the same century, Cyprian calls the Eucharist the Sacrament of the cup [o]; and elsewhere, the Sacrament of the Lord's passion and of our redemption [p].

[g] Dr. Wall, Inf. Bapt. part ii. chap. ix. p. 396, third edition.

[h] Vid. Bevereg. Vindic. Can. p. 199. Tentzel. Exercit. Select. part. ii. p. 127. Vitringa, de Vet. Synagog. p. 1116. Renaudotius Liturg. Orient. tom. i. pp. 5, 6. Bingham, xv. 7. 8.

[i] See Bingham, book xv. c. 7. sect. 8.

[k] 'Eucharistiae Sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino; etiam antelucanis coetibus, nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus.' Tertull. de Coron. c. iii. p. 102.

[l] Luke xxii. 17. See Archbishop Potter on Ch. G. p. 259, edit. 3rd.

[m] 'Sacramentum aquae.' Tertull. de Bapt. c. i. p. 224. c. xii. p. 229.

[n] 'Sacramentum sanctificationis.' Ibid. c. iv. p. 225.

[o] 'Sacramentum calicis.' Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 189.

[p] 'Sacramentum Dominicae passionis, et redemptionis nostrae.' Cyprian. Ep. 63.

If it should now be asked, in what precise meaning the name of Sacrament was thus anciently applied to the Eucharist; as the word Sacrament is of great latitude, and capable of various significations, (some stricter and some larger,) I know of no certain way of determining the precise meaning of the name, as here applied, but by considering what was meant by the thing. Gerard Vossius [q] has perhaps given as clear and accurate an account of the word Sacrament as one shall any where meet with: but after all, I am of opinion, that it is not the name which can here add any light to the thing, but the thing itself must be first rightly understood, in order to settle the true and full import of the name. When it is applied to Baptism and the Eucharist, it must be explained by their common nature, being a general name for such a certain number of ideas as go to make up their general nature or notion. A collection of those several ideas is put together in the definition given in our Church Catechism. The like had been endeavoured before, in our Twenty-fifth Article: and that is again digested into a more technical form, by Bishop Burnet in his Exposition [r]. His definition may be looked upon as a good summary account of what our Church, and the Protestant churches abroad, and the primitive churches likewise, believed concerning Baptism and the Eucharist in common: the particulars of their faith, so far, is therein collected into one large complex idea, and for conveniency is comprised in the single word Sacrament. And yet it must be observed, that this word Sacrament, as applied to those two religious rites, admits of a threefold acceptation in Church writers: sometimes denoting barely the outward sign of each, sometimes the thing signified, and sometimes both together, the whole action, service, or solemnity [s].

The Socinians, observing that the received sense of the word Sacrament is against their whole scheme, have often expressed their dislike of it. Smalcius particularly complains of it, as an unscriptural name, and besides, barbarous Latin, and leading to superstition and idolatry; and therefore he moves to have it

[q] Vossius de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia. Opp. tom. vi. p. 247, &c.
[r] Burnet on Art. XXV. pp. 268, 269.
[s] Vid. Lamb. Danaeus. Isag. part. iv. lib. 5. p. 441.

totally laid aside[t]. He was offended, it seems, at the name, because it served to keep up the sense of something mysterious, or mystical, of a sign and somewhat signified, viz. grace &c., to which he had an aversion. Volkelius, more complaisant with respect to the name, turns all his resentment upon the thing, flatly denying that the Eucharist is a Sacrament[u]: his reason is, because it neither exhibits nor seals any spiritual grace. His master Socinus had intimated as much before[x]. The sum is, that the strict sense of the Sacrament, as implying an outward sign of an inward grace, can never suit with their schemes, who allow of no inward grace at all.

I may here note by the way, that while the Socinians reject the invisible grace, the Romanists destroy the visible sign, and both run counter to the true notion of a Sacrament, by their opposite extremes: from whence it is manifest, of what moment it is to preserve the word Sacrament, and to assert to it its true and full sense. For though the word, as here applied, is not in Scripture, yet the notion is there, and the general doctrine is there: and the throwing that notion, or that general doctrine, under the name of Sacrament, is nothing more than collecting several Scripture ideas, or Scripture truths, and binding them up together in a single word, for the better preserving them, and for the ease and conveniency of speech. But as to the proof of those doctrines or those truths, I cannot enter into it now, but must reserve it for a more proper place, and proceed in the account of ancient names.

A.D. 107. *Eucharist.*

Another name, as famous as any, is the name Eucharist, signifying properly thanksgiving or blessing, and fitly denoting this

[t] 'Vox sacramenti, in hac significatione, barbara, vel saltem sacris literis incognita est; ab hominibus vero otiosis (qui ceremoniis hujusmodi nescio quid praeter sacram Scripturam superstitiosum, aut etiam idololatricum ex parte, tribuere non sunt veriti) ad tegendum dolum usurpata: praestat igitur aliis nominibus appellari in Christi coetu hanc ceremoniam.' Smalcius c. Frantz. p. 347.

[u] 'Satis constat nec alteram appellationem, nimirum sacramentum corporis Christi, veram esse. Si enim haec actio ne sacramentum quidem est, quo pacto, quaeso, corporis Christi sacramentum erit?' Volkel. de Ver. Relig. lib. iv. cap. 22. p. 678.

[x] Socinus de Baptism. Aquae, cap. xiv.

holy service, considered as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. I set the date no higher than Ignatius's Epistles, because there it first certainly occurs: though one can make no doubt of its having obtained in the apostolical age, when it is considered how familiarly Ignatius makes use of it[y]. Some have thought that St. Paul himself led the way as to this name, 1 Cor. xiv. 16. But that construction of the text appears too conjectural to build upon, and is rejected by the generality of interpreters; I think, with good reason, as Estius in particular hath manifested upon the place. I content myself therefore with running up that name no higher than Ignatius's time.

After him, Justin Martyr[z], Irenaeus[a], Clemens of Alexandria[b], Origen[c], and others, make familiar use of that name, as is well known. One may judge how extensive and prevailing that name, above any other, anciently was, from this consideration, that it passed not only among the Greeks, but among the Orientalists also, (as may be seen in the Syriac version before mentioned,) and likewise among the Latins; who adopted that very Greek word into their own language; as is plain from Tertullian[d] and Cyprian[e] in many places.

A.D. 150. *Sacrifice.* Θυσία.

Justin Martyr is the first I meet with who speaks of the Eucharist under the name of sacrifice or sacrifices. But he does it so often, and so familiarly[f], that one cannot but conceive, that

[y] Ignatius, Epist. ad Smyrn. c. 7, 8. ad Philadelph. c. 4.

[z] Justin. M. Apol. 96. Dialog. pp. 220, 386. Thirlby.

[a] Irenaeus, pp. 251, 294, 341, 360, ed. Bened.

[b] Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 178. ed. Oxon.

[c] Origen. contr. Cels. lib. viii. sect. 57. p. 784. ed. Bened.

[d] Tertullian. pp. 102, 135, 215, 220, 562, 570. Rigalt.

[e] Cyprian. Tract. pp. 132, 147, 230. Ep. pp. 34, 37, 38, 39, 117, 118, 125, 190, 191, 223. Ox. edit.

[f] Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε. Just. Dialog. p. 220, edit. Lond.

θυσίας ἃς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Ibid. p. 386.

ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι· ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς. Ibid. p. 387.

it had been in common use for some time before: and it is the more likely to have been so, because oblation (which is near akin to it) certainly was, as we have seen above.

Irenaeus of the same century mentions the sacrifice of the Eucharist more than once [g], either directly or obliquely. Tertullian, not many years later, does the like [h]. Cyprian also speaks of the sacrifice in the Eucharist, understanding it, in one particular passage, of the lay oblation [i]. This is not the place to examine critically what the ancients meant by the sacrifice or sacrifices of the Eucharist: it will deserve a distinct chapter in another part of this work. But, as I before observed of oblation, that, anciently, it was understood sometimes of the lay offering, the same I observe now of sacrifice; and it is plain from Cyprian. Besides that notion of sacrifice, there was another, and a principal one, which was conceived to go along with the Eucharistical service, and that was the notion of spiritual sacrifice, consisting of many particulars, as shall be shewn hereafter: and it was on the account of one or both, that the Eucharist had the name of sacrifice for the two first centuries. But by the middle of the third century, if not sooner, it began to be called a sacrifice, on account of the grand sacrifice represented and commemorated in it; the sign, as such, now adopting the name of the thing signified. In short, the memorial at length came to be called a sacrifice, as well as an oblation: and it had a double claim to be so called; partly as it was in itself a spiritual service or sacrifice, and partly as it was a representation and commemoration of the high tremendous sacrifice of Christ God-man. This last view of it, being

[g] 'Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum' &c. 'Sacrificia in populo, sacrificia et in ecclesia.' Iren. lib. iv. c. 18. p. 250. 'Omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc purum.' Lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249.

[h] 'Non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum. . . . Accepto corpore Domini et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii.' Tertull. de Orat. c. xiv. pp. 135, 136. 'Aut sacrificium offertur, aut Dei sermo administratur.' De cultu Fem. lib. ii. c. 11.

[i] 'Locuples, et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare te credis, quae corban omnino non respicis, quae in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quae partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulerit sumis.' Cyprian. de Op. et Eleëmos. p. 242. Bened., alias 223.

of all the most awful and most endearing, came by degrees to be the most prevailing acceptation of the Christian sacrifice, as held forth in the Eucharist. But those who styled the Eucharist a sacrifice on that account, took care, as often as need was, to explain it off to a memorial of a sacrifice rather than a strict or proper sacrifice, in that precise view. Cyprian, I think, is the first who plainly and directly styles the Eucharist a sacrifice in the commemorative view, and as representing the grand sacrifice[k]. Not that there was anything new in the doctrine, but there was a new application of an old name, which had at the first been brought in upon other accounts. I shall endeavour to set that whole matter clear in a chapter below: for the present these few hints may suffice, and so I pass on.

A.D. 150. *Commemoration, Memorial.* Ἀνάμνησις, Μνήμη.

Justin Martyr, if I mistake not, once names the Eucharist a commemoration or memorial; where he takes notice, that the Christians offered up spiritual sacrifices, prayers and lauds, in the memorial of their food dry and liquid[l], that is, in the Eucharist of bread and wine. I know not how otherwise to construe *ἀνάμνησις* there, but as a name of the whole service. It was natural enough, because many of the other names which have been used to denominate the whole service, (as breaking bread, oblation, sacrifice, and Eucharist,) manifestly took their original from some noted part of the solemnity, and were at first but partial conceptions of it. Now since the commemoration or memorial was always a considerable part of the solemnity, (as the learned well know,) it is reasonable to suppose, that that also might be made use of in like manner, as a name for the whole service.

I am aware that our excellent Mr. Mede gives a very different turn to that passage of Justin, translating it thus: 'In that thankful remembrance of their food both dry and liquid, wherein also is commemorated the passion which the Son of God suffered

[k] 'Passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus: passio est enim Domini sacrificium quod offerimus.' Cyprian. Ep. lxiii. p. 109. Bened.

[l] Ἐπ' *ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους δ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται.* Just. Dial. 387.

by himself.' He interprets it of agnizing God as the 'giver of our food both dry and liquid [m].' But that construction must needs appear harsh and unnatural. Justin nowhere else does ever speak of the remembrance of our food, but constantly understands the Eucharistical remembrance or commemoration to refer to Christ only, his incarnation and passion, his body and blood [n]: nor do I know of any one Father who interprets the memorial of the bodily food. Besides, it suits not well with our Lord's own account in his institution of the Sacrament, which speaks of the remembrance of him, not of the remembrance of our bodily food. Add to this, that were the sense of the place such as Mr. Mede imagined, Justin would rather have expressed it by a thankful remembrance of the Divine goodness in giving us our food, than by a thankful remembrance of our food, which appears flat and insipid in comparison. Seeing then that Mr. Mede's construction of that place in Justin is far from satisfactory, I choose to acquiesce in the sense which I before mentioned, till I see a better; understanding the memorial of food, as equivalent to memorial of Christ's passion, made by food, viz. by bread and wine. The word also refers not there to memorial, as if there were two memorials, but to the lauds; besides which there was also a memorial of the passion.

Origen has a passage relating to the Eucharistical memorial, where he appears to denominate the whole service by that eminent part of it [o]. Eusebius styles the Eucharist the memorial of our Lord's body and blood [p], and also simply a memorial: which he observes to have succeeded in the room of sacrifice [q]. He calls it also the memorial of the sacrifice [r], and memorial of

[m] Mede, Christian Sacrifice, b. ii. ch. 5. p. 460.

[n] Vid. Justin Mart. Dial. pp. 220, 290.

[o] 'Si referantur haec ad mysterii magnitudinem, invenies commemorationem istam habere ingentis propitiationis effectum. . . . . Si respicias ad illam commemorationem de qua dicit Dominus, hoc facite in meam commemorationem, invenias quod ista est commemoratio sola, quae propitium facit hominibus Deum.' Orig. in Levit. Hom. xiii. p. 255. ed. Bened.

[p] *Τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν.* Euseb. Demonst. Evangel. lib. i. cap. 10. p. 27.

[q] *Μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς, ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.* Ibid. p. 38. Cp. Apost. Const. lib. vi. cap. 23.

[r] *Τούτου δῆτα τοῦ θύματος τὴν μνή-*

the grand sacrifice[s]. I need not descend lower, to fetch in more authorities for the use of this name: only, I may just give a hint that all those Fathers who interpreted the name sacrifice, as applied in such a particular view to the Eucharist, by a memorial of a sacrifice, may as reasonably be understood to call the Eucharist a memorial, as to call it a sacrifice. Those Fathers were many, and Chrysostom may be esteemed their chief: who while he follows the ordinary language in denominating the Eucharist a sacrifice, (considered in its representative view,) yet intimates withal, that its more proper appellation, in that view, is a memorial of a sacrifice[t]. I may further take notice, that St. Austin comes very near to what I have been speaking of, where he calls the Eucharist by the name of the sacrament of commemoration, or sacramental memorial[u]. To conclude this article, let the reader observe and bear in mind, that the names of oblation and sacrifice, as applied to the Eucharist in one particular point of view, do both of them resolve into the name memorial: and so far they are all three to be looked upon as equivalent names, bearing the same sense, pointing to the same thing. This observation will be of use, when we come to consider the Eucharist in its sacrificial view under a distinct chapter below.

A.D. 249. *Passover.*

The name of Passover has been anciently given to the Eucharist, upon a presumption that as Christ himself succeeded to the paschal lamb, so the feast of the Eucharist succeeded in the room of the paschal feast. Christ is our Passover, as the name stands for the lamb[x]: the Eucharist is our

μην ἐπὶ τραπέζῃ ἐκτελεῖν, διὰ συμβόλων τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτηρίου αἵματος. Ibid. p. 30.

[s] Τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος. Ibid p. 40.

[t] Προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεθα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. . . . τὴν αὐτὴν θυσίαν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν, μᾶλλόν τε ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. Chrysost. in Epist. ad Hebr. cap. x. Hom. 17. p. 856. Compare Theodoret. in Hebr. viii. 4. p. 433. Pseud-Ambros. in Hebr. cap. x. Primasius, in Hebr. cap. x. Hesychius, in Levit. p. 31. Eulogius, apud Phot. cod. 280. p. 1609. Fulgentius, de Fide ad Petr. cap. lx. p. 525. Fragm. 618. Oecumenius, in Hebr. x. p. 846. Theophylact. in Hebr. x. 1. p. 971.

[u] 'Sacramentum memoriae.' Augustin. contr. Faust lib. xx. cap. 21. p. 348. Compare L'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part i. chap. 8. pp. 88, 89.

[x] 1 Cor. v. 7. John i. 29.

Passover, as that same name stands for the feast, service, or solemnity.

Origen seems to have led the way; and therefore I date the notion from his time: not that he speaks so fully to the point as some that came after, neither had he precisely the same ideas of it; but he taught more confusedly, what others after him improved and cleared. Origen takes notice, that 'if a man considers that Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, and that he ought to keep the feast by feeding upon the flesh of the Logos, he may celebrate the Passover all his life long, passing on to Godwards in thought, word, and deed, abstracted from temporal things [y].' I give his sense, rather than a literal rendering. Here we may observe, that the Christian Passover feast, according to him, consists in the eating of the flesh of the Logos; which is certainly done in the Eucharist by every faithful receiver, as Origen everywhere allows: but then Origen's common doctrine is, that the flesh of the Logos may be eaten also out of the Eucharist; for the receiving spiritual nutriment any way, is with him eating the flesh of Christ [z]. So that this passage which I have cited from him does not make the Eucharist, in particular, or solely, to be the Christian paschal feast: but the taking in spiritual food, be it in that way or any other, that is the keeping our Passover, according to his sense of it. Hilary, of the fourth century, seems directly to give the name of Passover to the Christian Eucharist [a]. Nazianzen, a great admirer of Origen, improves the thought, applying it directly and specially to the Eucharist, in these words: 'We shall partake of the Passover, which even now

[y] *Ἔτι δὲ ὁ νοήσας, ὅτι τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστὸς, καὶ χρὴ ἑορτάζειν ἐσθίοντα τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Λόγου· οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐ ποιεῖ τὸ πάσχα, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται διαβατήρια, διαβαίνων ἀεὶ τῷ λογισμῷ καὶ παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ πράξει ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ βίου πραγμάτων ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ σπεύδων.* Orig. contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 759. ed. Bened., alias p. 392.

[z] 'Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus, in quibus vita consistit. Sicut et ipse dicit, Verba quae locutus sum, spiritus et vita est.' Orig. in Num. Hom. xvi. p. 334. ed. Bened.

[a] 'Judas proditor indicatur, sine quo pascha, accepto calice et fracto pane, conficitur.' Hilar. in Matt. cap. xxx. p. 740. ed. Bened.

is but a type, though much more plain than the old one: for I am bold to say, that the legal Passover was an obscurer type of another type [b].'

St. Jerome, who was once Nazianzen's scholar, follows him in the same sentiment, styling the Eucharist the true sacrament of the Passover, in opposition to the old one [c]. But no one dwells more upon that thought, or more finely illustrates it, than the great St. Chrysostom in divers places. He asks why our Lord celebrated the Passover? And his answer is, because the old Passover was the figure of the future one, and it was proper, after exhibiting the shadow, to bring in the truth also upon the table [d]: a little after he says, 'it is our Passover to declare the Lord's death [e],' quoting 1 Cor. xi. 26. And he adds, that whoever comes with a pure conscience, celebrates the Passover, as often as he receives the communion, be it to-day, or to-morrow, or at any time whatever [f]. And he has more in the same place, to the same purpose. In another work he speaks thus: 'When the sun of righteousness appeared, the shadow disappeared: . . . therefore upon the self-same table both the Passovers were celebrated, the typical and the real [g].' A little lower, he calls the Eucharist the spiritual Passover [h]. Isidorus Pelusiota afterwards styles it the Divine and true Passover [i]. And St. Austin observes, that the Jews celebrate their Passover in a lamb, and we receive ours in the body and blood of the

[b] Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ πάσχα νῦν μὲν τυπικῶς ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον· τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος. Nazianz. Orat. lii. p. 692.

[c] 'Postquam typicum pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum apostolis comederat, assumit panem, qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum paschae transgreditur sacramentum: ut quomodo in praefiguratione ejus Melchisedec, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecit, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repraesentaret.' Hieronym. in Matt. cap. xxvi. p. 128. ed. Bened.

[d] Chrysost. tom. i. Orat. contr, Jud. 3. p. 610. ed. Bened.

[e] Πάσχα δέ ἐστι, τὸ τὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλειν. Ibid. p. 611.

[f] Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ, κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ὁποτεροῦν μετάσχῃ τῆς κοινωνίας. Ibid. p. 612.

[g] Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τραπέζῃ ἑκάτερον γίνεται πάσχα, καὶ τὸ τοῦ τύπου, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας. Chrysost. de Prodit. Jud. Hom. i. tom. 2. p. 383. Ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τραπέζης, καὶ τὸ τυπικὸν πάσχα ὑπερέγραψε, καὶ τὸ ἀληθινὸν προσέθηκε. Ibid.

[h] Τὸ πνευματικὸν πάσχα. Ibid.

[i] Τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα. Isidor. Pelus. lib. iv. Epist. 162. p. 504. ed. Paris.

Lord [k]. These are authorities sufficient for the name of Passover as applied to the Eucharist: for like as Baptism is in Scripture account the Christian circumcision [l], so is the Eucharist, in Church account at least, the Christian Passover.

A.D. 385. *Mass. Missa.*

There is one name more, a Latin name, and proper to the western churches, which may just deserve mentioning, because of the warm disputes which have been raised about it ever since the Reformation. It is the name mass, in Latin *missa;* originally importing nothing more than the dismission of a church assembly [m]. By degrees it came to be used for an assembly, and for Church service: so easily do words shift their sense, and adopt new ideas. From signifying Church service in general, it came at length to denote the Communion service in particular, and so that most emphatically came to be called the Mass. St. Ambrose is reasonably supposed to be the earliest writer now extant who mentions mass in that emphatical sense [n]. Higher authorities have been pretended: but they are either from the spurious Decretal Epistles, or from liturgical offices of modern date in comparison [o].

So much for the ancient names of the Sacrament: not that I took upon me to number up all, but those only which appeared to me most considerable. More may be seen in Hospinian, Casaubon, Suicer, or Turretin, collected into one view, with their proper authorities. It is time for me now to proceed directly to the consideration of the Sacrament itself; in the meanwhile hoping that my readers will excuse it, if I have hitherto detained them too long in the preliminaries, intended to open and clear the way to the main subject.

[k] 'Aliud est pascha quod adhuc Judaei de ove celebrant, aliud autem quod nos in corpore et sanguine Domini accipimus.' Augustin. contr. Lit. Petiliani, lib. ii. cap. 37.

[l] Coloss. ii. 11.

[m] Hence Missa Catechumenorum, and Missa Fidelium. See Cangius's Glossarium in Missa; and Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. n. 59. p. 418, alias 582.

[n] 'Missam facere coepi.' Ambros. Epist. 20. ad Marcellin. p. 853. ed. Bened.

[o] Compare Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. pp. 262, 272, &c. Bingham, b. xiii. chap. 1.

CHAP. II.

Of the Institution of the Holy Communion.

IT will be proper to begin with the institution of this Sacrament by Christ our Lord, as recorded by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul. It is an argument of the great weight and importance of it, that we have it four times recorded in the New Testament, only with some slight variations, while what one or more omit, another supplies. The most complete as well as shortest view of the whole may be taken by throwing all into one, in some such manner as here follows:

Matt. xxvi. Mark xiv. Luke xxii. 1 Cor. xi.

'The night in which the Lord Jesus was betrayed, as they were eating, or did eat, Jesus took bread, and giving thanks, blessed it, and brake it, and gave it unto his disciples, and said; Take, eat, this is my body, which is given and broken for you; do this in remembrance of me. After supper likewise, having taken the cup, and given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this cup is my blood of the new covenant, the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you, for many, for the remission of sins: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me, (and they all drank of it.) Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until that day, when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father, in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out to the mount of Olives.'

The circumstance of time is the first thing here observable: it was 'in the night in which he was betrayed[p]' that our Lord instituted this holy Sacrament. Our Lord designed it (besides other uses) for a standing memorial of his passion: and to shew the more plainly that he did so, or to render it the more affecting, he delayed the institution to the last period of his life.

A more material circumstance is, that he began the institution

[p] 1 Cor. xi. 23.

as they were eating, or after they had been eating: here the question is, what had they been eating? It is commonly supposed the paschal lamb. For St. Matthew in the same chapter relates, that on the first day of unleavened bread, the disciples came and asked, 'Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?' And the Lord made answer, that he would 'keep the Passover with his disciples,' and the disciples actually prepared the Passover[q]. St. Mark reports the same[r]. St. Luke confirms it, and adds this further circumstance, that our Lord, upon his sitting down to supper, said, 'With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you, before I suffer[s].' Nevertheless, it seems from St. John's account, that the day of the legal Passover was not yet come, that it was 'before the feast of the Passover' that our Lord had his supper[t]; that part of Friday, passion-day, was but the preparation[u] of the paschal feast. These seeming differences have occasioned very long and intricate disputes between Greeks and Latins, and among learned men both ancient and modern, which remain even to this day. I shall not presume to take the place of a moderator in so nice a debate, but shall be content to report as much as may serve to give the reader some notion of it, sufficient for my present purpose. There are three several schemes or opinions in this matter: 1. The most ancient and most prevailing is, that our Lord kept the legal Passover, and on the same day with the Jews: and those who are in this sentiment have their probable solutions with respect to St. John's accounts, while they claim the three other Evangelists as entirely theirs. 2. The second opinion is, that our Lord anticipated (for weighty reasons) the time of the Jewish Passover, and so kept his before theirs: or rather, he kept his Passover at the true legal time, when the Jews (or some at least of the Jews) postponed theirs illegally. This opinion has also its difficulties, and the maintainers of it have contrived some plausible solutions. 3. The third opinion is, that our Lord kept no Passover properly so called, but had a supper,

[q] Matt. xxvi. 17, 18, 19. [r] Mark xiv. 12—16. [s] Luke xxii. 15.
[t] John xiii. 1, 2. [u] John xix. 14; compare xviii. 28.

and afterwards instituted the Eucharist, the mystical or Christian Passover; called Passover in such a sense as Baptism is called Circumcision, succeeding in its room. This last opinion had some patrons of old time, and more of late, and seems to gain ground. I shall here transcribe what a learned and judicious writer of our own has lately pleaded in behalf of it, though it may be thought somewhat prolix. It is in his notes on Matt. xxvi. 17[x].

'Here occurs a question and a difference between the words of St. John and the other three, concerning the day of the week on which the Jews kept the Passover that year 4746, A. D. 33. It is plain by all the four Gospels, that this day on which Christ did at night eat the Passover (or what some call the Passover) was Thursday. And one would think by reading the three, that that was the night on which the Jews did eat their Passover lamb. But all the texts of St. John are clear, that they did not eat it till the next night, Friday night, before which night Christ was crucified and dead, having given up the ghost about the ninth hour, viz. three of the clock in the afternoon. St. John does speak of a supper which Christ did eat on Thursday night with his Apostles, chap. xiii. 1, 2, but he does not call it a Passover supper, but, on the contrary, says it was before the feast of the Passover, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα*: by which, I think, he means the day before the Passover, or the Passover eve as we should say. Now this was the same night, and the same supper which the three do call the Passover, and Christ's eating the Passover. I mean, it was the night on which Christ was (a few hours after supper) apprehended; as is plain by the last verse of that thirteenth chapter. But the next day (Friday, on which Christ was crucified) St. John makes to be the Passover day. He says, (chap. xviii. 28,) the Jews would not go into the judgment-hall on Friday morning, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover, viz. that evening. And, chap. xix. 14, speaking of Friday noon, he says, it was the preparation of the Passover. Upon the

[x] Dr. Wall's Critical Notes on the New Testament, p. 33.

whole, John speaks not of eating the Passover at all: nor indeed do the three speak of his eating any lamb. Among all the expressions which they use, 'of making ready the Passover;' 'prepare for thee to eat the Passover;' 'with desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you,' &c., there is no mention of any lamb carried to the temple to be slain by the Levites, and then brought to the house and roasted: there is no mention of any food at the supper beside bread and wine: perhaps there might be bitter herbs. So that this seems to have been a commemorative supper used by our Saviour instead of the proper paschal supper, the eating of a lamb; which should have been the next night, but that he himself was to be sacrificed before that time would come. And the difference between St. John and the other is only a difference in words, and in the names of things: they call that the Passover, which Christ used instead of it.

'If you say, why then does Mark xiv. 12 call Thursday the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, and Luke xxii. 7 the day of unleavened bread when the passover must be killed? we must note, that their day (or νυχθήμερον) was from evening to evening. This Thursday evening was the beginning of that natural day of twenty-four hours, towards the end of which the lamb was to be killed: so it is proper in the Jews' way of calling days to call it that day.' Thus far Dr. Wall.

Deylingius, a learned Lutheran, has more minutely canvassed the same question, and maintained the same side[y]. I shall not take upon me to say positively which of the three opinions is the best, or clogged with fewest difficulties. If the last of the three be preferred, then the Eucharist is as properly the Christian Passover, as Baptism is the Christian Circumcision; and we have the authority of our Lord himself, or of his disciples, for so calling it, if they gave that name to the whole transaction. But whatever hypothesis we follow, there will be proof sufficient that the Eucharist succeeded in the room of the Passover, like as Baptism succeeded in the room of Circumcision.

[y] Deylingius, Observat. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 233—249. Lipsiae, 1720. Compare his Observationes Miscellaneae, Lips. 1736, where he again strongly maintains the same opinion, from p. 239 to p. 248.

It appears to be well agreed among the learned of all parties, that the Christian Eucharist succeeded in the place of the Jewish Passover: and good use has been often made of the observation, for the explaining the nature of the Eucharist, as well as the phrase of the institution. Buxtorf has laboured with most advantage in this argument in his two tracts, (one against Scaliger[z], and the other against Cappellus[a],) and has so exhausted the subject, especially as to what concerns the forms and phrases, that he seems to have left but small gleanings for those that come after him. Yet some additional improvements have been since thrown in by learned hands[b]. The resembling circumstances common to the Jewish and Christian Passover may be divided into two kinds: some relating to the things themselves, some to the phrases and forms made use of here and there. It may not be improper to present the reader with a brief detail of those resembling circumstances.

I. Of the first sort are these: 1. The Passover was of Divine appointment, and so is the Eucharist. 2. The Passover was a sacrament, and so is the Eucharist. 3. The Passover was a memorial[c] of a great deliverance from temporal bondage; the Eucharist is a memorial of a greater deliverance from spiritual bondage. 4. The Passover prefigured the death of Christ[d] before it was accomplished, the Eucharist represents or figures out our Lord's death now past. 5. The Passover was a kind of federal rite between God and man, so also is the Eucharist. 6. As no one was to eat of the Passover before he had been circumcised[e], so no one is to partake of the Eucharist before he has been baptized. 7. As the Jews were obliged to come clean to the Passover[f], so are Christians obliged to come well prepared to the Communion[g]. 8. As slight defilements (where there was no contempt) did not debar a man from the Passover, nor excuse

[z] Buxtorf. Dissertat. vi. de Coenae Dominicae primae Ritibus et Forma.

[a] Vindiciae Exercitat. de Coena Domini adv. Lud. Cappel. p. 338, &c.

[b] Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. p. 165, &c. Bucherus, Antiq. Biblicae, p. 360, &c.

[c] Exod. xii. 14; xiii. 9. Deut. xvi. 3.

[d] Vid. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 415, &c.

[e] Exod. xii. 43—48.

[f] Num. ix. 6.

[g] 1 Cor. xi. 27, 28, 29.

his neglect of it [h], so neither do smaller offences, where there is an honest heart, either forbid or excuse a man's absenting from this sacrament. 9. As a total contempt or neglect of the Passover was crime great enough to render the offender liable to be 'cut off from Israel [i],' so a total contempt or neglect of the Holy Communion is in effect to be cut off from Christianity. 10. As the Passover was to continue as long as the Jewish law should stand in force, so must the Eucharist abide as long as Christianity [k]. I have thrown these articles together in a short compass for the present, only to give the reader a brief general view of the analogy between those two Sacraments; and not that he should take the truth of every particular for granted, without further proof, if anything of moment should be hereafter built upon any of them.

II. The other sort of resembling circumstances concern the particular forms and phrases made use of in the institution: and it is in these chiefly that the great masters of Jewish antiquities, before referred to, have obliged the Christian world. I shall offer a short summary of these likewise.

1. In the paschal supper, the master of the house took bread and blessed it in a prayer of thanksgiving to God: and the rule was, never to begin the blessing till he had the bread in hand, that so the prayer of benediction directed to God might at the same time be understood to have relation to the bread, and might draw down a blessing upon it [l]. It is obvious to see how applicable all this is to our Lord's conduct in the first article of the institution.

2. The breaking of the bread, after benediction, was a customary practice in the Jewish feasts [m]: only in the paschal feast it is said that the bread was first broken and the benediction followed [n]. But whether our Lord varied then, in a slight circumstance, or the Jews have varied since, may remain a question.

[h] Num. ix. 10. 2 Chron. xxx. 18.

[i] Exod. xii. 15. Num. ix. 13. Cp. Bucher. Antiq. p. 402.

[k] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

[l] See Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. p. 171, &c. Bucherus, Antiq. Evangel. p. 368, &c. Buxtorf. de Coena Domini, p. 310.

[m] Buxtorf. 313. Bucherus, 372.

[n] Lightfoot, Temple Service, c. xiii. sect. 7. p. 964; and on Matt. xxvi. 26, p. 259. Pfaffius, p. 178.

3. The distributing the bread to the company, after the benediction and fraction, was customary among the Jews [o]: and here likewise our Lord was pleased to adopt the like ceremony.

Several learned men have suggested [p], that the words 'This is my body,' might be illustrated from some old Jewish forms made use of in the Passover feast; as, This is the bread of affliction, &c., and, This is the body of the Passover: but Buxtorf (who best understood these matters), after considering once and again, constantly rejected the former, and demurred to the other instance [q], as not pertinent, or not early enough to answer the purpose: and Bucherus [r], who has carefully re-examined the same, passes the like doubtful judgment; or rather rejects both the instances as improper, not being found among the Jewish rituals, or being too late to come into account. So I pass them by. Justin Martyr, I cannot tell how, was persuaded, that Esdras, at a Passover, had said to the Jews, This Passover (*i.e.* paschal lamb) is our Saviour and our refuge [s], and that the Jews after Christ's time had erased the passage out of the Septuagint. He was certainly mistaken in his report: but the words are worth the observing, as discovering what the Christians in his time thought of the Passover as a type of Christ, and how they understood paschal phrases, parallel to 'This is my body,' &c.

4. The words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' making part of the institution, are reasonably judged to allude to the ancient paschal solemnities, in which were several memorials [t]: and the service itself is more than once called a memorial in the Old Testament, as before noted.

[o] Buxtorf. 316. Bucherus, 374.

[p] See particularly Pfaffius de Oblat. p. 179. And Deylingius, (Miscellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.), who refers to such authors as have espoused the first of the instances, after Baronius and Scaliger.

[q] Buxtorf. Dissert. vi. de Coena, p. 301. Dissert. vii. Vindic. pp. 347, 348.

[r] Bucherus, Antiq. Evangel. p. 375. Compare Deylingius (Miscellan. Sacr. p. 228, &c.), who absolutely rejects one and doubts of the other.

[s] Καὶ εἶπεν Ἐσδρὰς τῷ λαῷ, τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν. Justin Mart. Dial. p. 292. edit. Thirlby. Cp. Wolfius, 1 Cor. v. 7.

[t] 'Ἀνάμνησις ritus Hebraeorum redolet: habebant namque Judaei, in celebratione agni paschalis, plures ejusmodi ἀναμνήσεις et recordationes,' &c. Bucherus, p. 379.

5. In the ancient paschal feast, the master of the house was wont to take cup after cup (to the number of four) into his hands, consecrating them one after another by a short thanksgiving; after which each consecrated cup was called a cup of blessing. It is judged by the learned in Jewish antiquities [u], that the third or fourth cup (Buxtorf is positive for the fourth) was what our Lord was pleased to sanctify, by taking it into his hand, and giving thanks over it. It is doubted what the words 'after supper' mean; whether in the close of the paschal supper, as some think [x], or after they had eaten bread, as others construe [y]: but the difference is not of moment, and so I pass on.

6. At the institution of the Passover it was said, 'The blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you [z],' &c. The blood was the token of the covenant in that behalf, between God and his people; as circumcision before had been a token [a] also of a like covenant, and called covenant [b] as well as token. In the institution of the Communion, our Lord says, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is shed for you, for many, for the remission of sins.' The cup is here by a figure put for wine; and covenant, according to ancient Scripture phrase, is put for token of a covenant; and wine, representative of Christ's blood, answers to the blood of the Passover, typical of the same blood of Christ [c]: and the

[u] Pfaffius de Oblat. Euch. p. 173. Buxtorf. in Lex. Talmud. pp. 614, 616. Dissert. vi. p. 300. Lightfoot on Matt. xxvi. 27, p. 259. Bucherus, pp. 380—384. Zornius Opusc. Sacr. tom ii. p. 14, &c. Hooper on Lent, part ii. cap. 3. p. 173.

[x] Lightfoot, pp. 259, 260.

[y] 'Μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι [1 Cor. xi. 25.] non vertendum est, post coenam communem, qualis nunquam fuit, sed remote post coenam paschalem: vel, quod vero similius est, proxime et immediate post esum panis consecrati; cui expositioni respondet recensio historica Luc. xxii. 20, ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, postquam comederant, scil. panem consecratum, quam versionem sequuntur Arabs et Persa. Sic Graecis δεῖπνον quidem ἰδίως coenam, sed παχυλῶς et καταχρηστικῶς saepe cibum et quodvis epulum connotat; qua notione Hesiodus dixit δεῖπνον ποιεῖν, comedere, cibum sumere,' &c. Bucher. p. 362.

[z] Exod. xii. 13.

[a] Gen. xvii. 11.

[b] Gen. xvii. 10. 'This is my covenant,' &c.; and v. 13, 'my covenant shall be in your flesh,' &c.

[c] 'Deus speciali mandato sacrificia et primitias offerendas ordinavit, maxime effusionem sanguinis, ut ab initio hominem haberent unde effusionis per Christum tacite recordari

remission of sins here, answers to the passing over there, and preserving from plague. These short hints may suffice at present, just to intimate the analogy between the Jewish Passover and the Christian Eucharist in the several particulars of moment here mentioned.

7. At the paschal feast there was an annunciation or declaration [d] of the great things which God had done for that people: in like manner, one design of the Eucharist is to make a declaration of the mercies of God in Christ, to 'shew the Lord's death till he come.'

8. Lastly, at the close of the paschal supper, they were wont to sing an hymn [e] of praise: and the like was observed in the close of the institution of the Christian Eucharist; as is recorded in the Gospels.

The many resembling circumstances, real and verbal, which I have here briefly enumerated, do abundantly shew that this holy Eucharist was in a great measure copied from the paschal feast, and was intended to supply its place, only heightening the design, and improving the application. The use of the observation may appear afterwards, when we come to consider more minutely either the general intent or the particular parts of this Christian service.

CHAP. III.

Of the Commemoration or Remembrance of Christ in the Holy Communion.

SINCE the end or design of anything is always considered as first in view, antecedent in natural order to the performance, so the rules of just method require that in treating of this Sacra-

possent. Dan. ix. 24. Heb. ix. et x. Rom. iii. Praeter caeteras oblationes Deo factas, commemorabilia sunt sacrificia in festo expiationum. . . . . Tum quoque sacrificium agni paschalis, et quotidiani, seu jugis sacrificii, attendi debet. Hos igitur ad ritus et oblationes alludit Christus cum ait, Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Observant praeterea viri docti vinum rufum, quale in illis regionibus crescebat, ac in primis in coena paschali bibebatur, egregiam nobis sanguinis memoriam relinquere.' Bucher. Antiq. Evan. p. 389.

[d] See Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 778. Pfaffius, p. 181.

[e] See Lightfoot, vol. ii. pp. 258, 260. Pfaffius, p. 181.

ment we should begin with some account of the proximate end and design of it; namely, the commemoration or remembrance of Christ, 'This do in remembrance of me[f];' and particularly of his death and passion, 'shew the Lord's death till he come[g].' I call it the proximate or immediate end, because the ultimate end of all is the happiness of man, or, what is coincident therewith, the glory of God. Our blessed Lord seeks not his own glory, but the good of his creatures, in all that he appoints them to do. He is not capable of receiving advantage, or any real addition to his own glory, by any of our commemorations or services: but all these things are graciously appointed for our present and future benefit; and we may be confident that Christ, the Captain of our salvation, would prescribe nothing in a particular manner, which does not as particularly contribute to that end. Some Divines, of a refined and elevated way of thinking, will not allow that God can have any end but himself, in anything that he does, because he can have no higher: but then they do not mean that God proposes to himself any increase of happiness or of essential glory, to which nothing can be added; but that, as he is naturally benevolent, and as he takes delight in his own being and attributes, (the most worthy of his love,) so he delights in the exercise of his goodness, and chooses it as worthy of himself, and, in this sense, acts only for himself. In such a sense as this, our blessed Lord may be said to have acted for himself, or for his own glory, in what he did for mankind: but it can in no sense be allowed, that he receives any advantage by what we say or do; and therefore the ultimate end (so considered) of our commemorations or services is the benefit accruing from thence to ourselves: what they are we shall see in due time and place. This being premised for clearer conception, or to prevent mistakes, I now proceed.

The commemoration of our Lord's dying for us includes two things; the consideration of him as Lord, and as dying; one expressing his personal dignity, the other expressing his

[f] Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

[g] 1 Cor. xi. 26. Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ.

meritorious sufferings relative to us. The first of the two may suffice for the present: the second may be reserved for a distinct chapter.

I here take for my ground the words of our Lord, 'This do in remembrance of me.' The Greek words *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* may bear three several renderings (or four): 1. In remembrance of me. 2. In commemoration of me. 3. For a memorial of me, or, for my memorial. They differ not much in sense, but yet as they do differ, they may deserve a distinct consideration. The second includes the first; and the third includes both the former, not *vice versâ*: so they rise, as it were, in sense, and are so many distinct gradations, as shall be shewn presently.

I. I begin with the first and lowest, this do 'in remembrance of me.' The Socinians, (some of them at least,) not content with supposing this remembrance or commemoration to be one considerable end or part of this Sacrament, make it to be the only end or use of it [h]; yea and sometimes go so far as to say that it constitutes the very nature or essence of this holy rite: for they interpret the words, 'This is my body,' so as to mean, this action, this eating and drinking, is the memorial of Christ's body broken [i], &c. Which is overdoing, and neglecting to distinguish between the thing itself, and the end or design of it; between what is done, and for what purpose it is done. We eat bread and we drink wine in the Sacrament, the symbols of Christ's body and blood; and we do so for this reason, among others, that Christ may be remembered, and the merits of his passion celebrated. But this I hint by the way only, and pass

[h] 'Et haec quidem quam explicuimus, mortis Christi annuntiatio proprius est, atque unicus Coenae Dominicae finis,' &c. Volkel. de Coen. Dom. p. 687.

[i] 'Haec actio frangendi et comedendi panem, est corpus, hoc est commemoratio Christi corporis pro nobis fracti.' Smalc. cont. Frantz. p. 315.

'Corpus Christi et sanguinem Christi pro memoriali signo corporis Christi fracti, et sanguinis fusi sumimus: commemorationem autem, istius sacri ritus finem usumque esse dicimus.' Schlichting. contr. Meisn. p. 761. 'Ritus istius naturam in panis fractione et esu, et e poculo potu, perque haec in mortis Christi representatione quadam, sitam esse dicimus.' Ibid. pp. 785, 786.

on to what I design. Remembrance of Christ is undoubtedly a principal end of this Sacrament. It is not declared by the institution itself, in what view, or under what capacity we are here to remember him; but that must be learned from other places of Scripture, which declare who and what he is: for certainly we are to remember him in such a light as the Old and New Testament have represented him in. This appears to be an allowed principle on all hands: for none think themselves obliged to stop in the bare words of the institution, without carrying their inquiries further into the whole compass of Scripture, when they see proper. The Socinians themselves will not scruple to allow that Christ may or ought to be remembered in the Sacrament as Lord, in their sense, or as Master, or Saviour, or Head, or Judge, though there is not a word of Lord, or Master, or Saviour, or Head, or Judge, in the bare form of the institution as delivered by Christ: but those names or titles are to be fetched from other places of Scripture. Therefore, I say, it is allowed by all parties, that we ought to remember Christ, in the holy Communion, according to what he is, by the Scripture account of him. This foundation being laid, I go on to the superstructure: and for the more distinct conception of what this remembrance implies or contains, I shall take leave to proceed by several steps or degrees.

1. It is not sufficient to remember Christ merely as a very great and good man, a wise instructor, and an admirable teacher, while he lived, received up into celestial bliss and glory when he died: for all this comes vastly short of what sacred Writ declares of him; and is indeed no more (if so much) than what the Pagans themselves, the Platonists, particularly of the second and third centuries, were ready to admit. For, being struck with the fame of his undoubted miracles, and with the inimitable force of his admirable precepts, holy life, and exemplary death, they could not but revere and honour his memory; neither could they refuse to assign him a place among their chief sages or deities[k]. And all the plea they had left for

[k] See this particularly proved in a very learned and curious dissertation, written by Laurence Mosheim, and lately inserted, with improvements,

not receiving Christianity was, that his disciples (as was pretended) had revolted, or degenerated, and had not duly observed the wholesome instructions of their high leader[l]. Those Pagan philosophers therefore, as I said, remembered Christ, in as high a view as this article amounts to: a Christian remembrance must go a great deal higher.

2. It is not sufficient to remember Christ merely as an eminent prophet, or one of the chief prophets, an ambassador from heaven, and one that received his Gospel from above, wrought miracles, lived a good life, was deified after death, and will come again to judge mankind: for all this the Mahometans themselves (or some sects amongst them) can freely own, and they pay a suitable regard to his memory on that score[m]. It is all vastly below what the Scriptures plainly testify of him, and therefore does not amount to a Christian remembrance of him.

3. Neither yet is it sufficient to remember Christ as our Head, Lord, and Master, to whom we owe such regard as disciples do to their leader or founder: for all this is no more than what the Jews justly ascribed to Moses, who was but the servant of Christ[n]. And it is no more than what many nominal Christians, ancient and modern, many half-believers have owned, and what all but declared apostates or infidels must own. And it comes not up to what the Scriptures fully and frequently teach, and therefore does not amount to a due remembrance of him.

into his Latin translation of Cudworth, vol. ii. Cp. Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 18. 'Christum, Servatorem nostrum, virum magnum, divinum, et sapientissimum fuisse non inficiabantur, qui egregia et divina plane docuisset, cumque a Judaeis injustissimo supplicio necatus fuisset, in coelum ad Deos commeasset.' Moshem. ibid. p. 23. Hence perhaps it was, that the Emperor Alexander Severus, (of the third century,) along with the images of Apollonius and Orpheus, had others of Abraham and Jesus Christ, receiving them as deities. Lamprid. Vit. Severi.

[l] 'Descivisse scilicet a sanctissimi praeceptoris sui scitis Christianos Platonici criminabantur . . . . atque castam et sanam ejus disciplinam variis erroribus inquinasse. . . . . 1. Quod divinis Christum honoribus afficerent; nec enim a suis id postulasse Christum. 2. Quod Deos negligerent, et eorum cultum extinctum vellent; Christum enim ipsum a Diis haud alienum fuisse.' Moshem. ibid. p. 24.

[m] See Reland. de Religione Mohammedica, pp. 25, 33, 34, 44, 45, 212, 224. David Millius, Dissert. x. de Mohammedismo, pp. 344, 345, 346.

[n] Heb. iii. 2–6.

4. Neither, lastly, is it sufficient to remember Christ as higher than the angels, or older than the system of the world: for that is not more than many misbelievers, of former or of later times, have made no scruple to own, and it is still short of the Scripture accounts.

For, according to the whole tenor both of Old and New Testament, Jesus Christ is not merely our Lord, Master, Judge, &c., but our Divine Lord and Master; Lord in such a sense as to be Jehovah and God of Israel, God before the creation, and by whom all creatures were made[o]; who 'laid the foundation of the earth,' and even the 'heavens are the works of his hands[p];' who has a rightful claim to be worshipped and adored, by men, by angels[q], by the whole creation[r]. And no wonder, since he is described in sacred Writ as 'God with us[s],' as Lord God[t], 'true God[u],' 'great God[x],' 'mighty God[y],' 'over all, God blessed for ever[z].' Such is the Scripture account of our blessed Lord, and his personal dignity; and therefore as such we ought to remember him as often as we think of him, and more particularly at the Communion table. For since the value of what our Lord has done or suffered rises in proportion to the dignity of the person so doing or suffering, it is manifest that we cannot duly or suitably remember him in the Sacrament, if we entertain not those high and honourable conceptions of him, which such his personal dignity demands. If the sending of the only-begotten Son into the world, to suffer, bleed, and die for us, was really the highest instance of Divine love which could possibly have been given: and if we are obliged, in return, to express our thankfulness in a way suitable thereto: and if such a suitable return is altogether impracticable without a just sense of the favour granted: and if no just sense can be had of it, while we take away the most endearing and enforcing consideration, which most of all enhances the value of it: if these premises be true, the conclusion is plain and necessary, that as often as we

[o] John i. 1, 2, 3.
[p] Heb. i. 10.
[q] Heb. i. 6.
[r] Rev. v. 13.
[s] Matt. i. 23.
[t] Luke i. 16, 17.
[u] 1 John v. 20.
[x] Tit. ii. 13.
[y] Isa. ix. 6.
[z] Rom. ix. 5.

The reader who desires to see these several texts explained, and objections answered, may please to compare my Eight Sermons, and particularly the sixth.

remember Christ in the Eucharist, we ought to remember him not barely as a wise man, or a good man, or an eminent prophet, or chief martyr, or as our particular Master, or Founder, or Redeemer, but as an almighty Saviour and Deliverer, as the only-begotten of the Father, 'very God of very God,' of the same Divine nature, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal. He that remembers him in any lower sense than this, in opposition to this, is not worthy of him; neither can he be esteemed by sober and discerning Christians as a worthy partaker of the holy Communion.

To confirm this reasoning drawn from Scripture texts, I shall subjoin some human, but very ancient authorities. They are what all writers, so far as I can perceive, in some degree value, and think it an honour to have, if they can but contrive any colourable pretensions to them[a]: and it is only when disappointment makes them despair, that they affect to contemn what they cannot arrive to. Justin Martyr is a very early writer, born about the year 89, (as appears probable,) and writing within forty or fifty years of the latest Apostle. It is worth the while to know what so early and so considerable a person thought of a Christian Sacrament, which he had so often frequented; especially when he gives us a formal, solemn account of it, in the name of his Christian brethren, and in an address to the Emperor. 'This food we call the Eucharist, of which none are allowed to be partakers but such only as are true believers, and have been baptized in the laver of regeneration for the remission of sins, and live according to Christ's precepts. For we do not take this as common bread and common wine: but as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the Logos of God, and had real flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that this food, which the very same Logos blessed by prayer and thanksgiving, is turned into the nourishment and substance of our flesh and blood, and is in some sense the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus[b].' I choose to follow

[a] See my Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, vol. iii. pp. 655, 656

[b] Justin Mart. Apol. i. cap. 86. p. 96. edit. Thirlby. Reeves, vol. i. pp. 120, 121.

Mr. Reeves's translation of this passage, though somewhat paraphrastical, because he has very well hit off the sense. What I have to observe upon it, as suitable to my present purpose, is, that particular notice is twice taken of the incarnation of the Logos, (that is, of God incarnate, according to Justin's known doctrine of the Logos being God,) and the Sacrament is not only supposed to be a commemoration[c], but a kind of emblem of it by Justin's account[d], as the intelligent reader will observe. The reason is, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is the Sacrament of the passion[e], and God the Son, by becoming incarnate, first became passible. All which will be made plainer by another passage of the same Justin, in his Dialogue with the Jew[f], which is as follows: 'That prayers and thanksgivings, made by those who are worthy, are the only sacrifices that are perfect and well pleasing to God, I also affirm: for these are the only ones which Christians have been taught to perform even in that remembrance [or memorial] of their food both dry and liquid, wherein also is commemorated the passion which God of God suffered in his own person, [or for them].' I have no need to take notice here of more than is to my present purpose. The words 'God of God' are what I point to, as a proof that the Divinity of Christ was an important article of the Eucharistical remembrance. If any should incline to read 'Son of God,' (upon conjecture, for it is no more,) instead of 'God of God,' in that place, it will still amount to the same, because Justin always understood the phrase of 'Son of God' in the highest and strongest

[c] Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν δι' οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε. Justin Mart. Dial. p. 290.

[d] How this was understood, see explained in a Charge on the Doctrinal Use of the Sacraments, p. 25.

[e] Εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους οὗ ἔπαθεν. Justin Mart. Dial. p. 220.

[f] Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ, καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημί. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται. Justin Mart. Dial. p. 387.

A conjectural emendation has been offered, directing us to read δι' αὐτοὺς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Mede, Opp. p. 362. Thirlby in loc. I see not why ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ may not mean the same with ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ: perhaps ἐκ might have been negligently dropped. The learned editor ingenuously says, 'istud Θεὸς admodum sane invitus muto, propter sequentia.'

sense as meaning 'God of God[g].' But I see no necessity of admitting any new conjectural change of ὁ Θεὸς into ὁ υἱὸς, since Θεὸς is very frequently our Lord's title in Justin[h], yea, and ὁ Θεὸς more than once[i]. But I proceed.

I shall subjoin a passage of Origen, containing the like elevated sentiments of the remembrance made in the holy Communion. 'Thou that art come to Christ, (the true High Priest, who by his blood has reconciled God to thee, and thee to the Father,) rest not in the blood of the flesh, but consider rather the blood of the Logos, and hear him declaring, This is my blood which shall be shed for you, for remission of sins: the initiated in the mysteries well understand both the flesh and the blood of God the Word[k].' So I translate the last words, as most agreeable to Origen's usual phraseology: but if any one chooses rather to say 'Logos of God,' it comes to the same thing. The sum is, that the life and soul, as it were, of the Eucharistical remembrance lies in the due consideration of the Divine dignity of the Person whose passion we there remember[l]. And indeed every man's own reason must convince him that it must be so, if he ever seriously calls to mind the Scripture accounts of our blessed Lord, which I have above recited. Hitherto I have confined myself to the strict notion of remembrance.

II. I am next to advance a step further to commemoration, which is remembrance and somewhat more. For to a bare remembering it superadds the notion of extolling, honouring, celebrating, and so it is collecting all into one complex idea of

[g] Ὅς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει. p. 94. Cp. pp. 406, 408, 411.

[h] Justin Mart. pp. 204, 210, 233, 250, 261, 263, 265, 273, 291, 303, 328, 408, 409.

[i] Justin Mart. pp. 251, 326, 378.

[k] 'Tu qui ad Christum venisti, (Pontificem verum qui sanguine suo Deum tibi propitium fecit, et reconciliavit te Patri) non haereas in sanguine carnis; sed disce potius sanguinem Verbi, et audi ipsum tibi dicentem, quia hic sanguis meus est, qui pro vobis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Novit qui mysteriis imbutus est, et carnem et sanguinem Verbi Dei.' Orig. in Levit. Hom. ix. pp. 243, 244, ed. Bened. Cp. Clem. Alex. Paedagog. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 186: τὸν λόγον ἐκχεόμενον, &c.

[l] Great use was afterwards made of this consideration in the Nestorian controversy: of which see Cyrill. Alex. Ep. ad Nestor. p. 72. et Anathem. xi. cum Explanat. p. 156. Item Apologet. advers. Oriental. pp. 192, 193.

commemorating. This do 'in commemoration of me:' which is the second rendering of the same words. Some perhaps might wonder why the Socinians, of all men, should reject the notion of remembering, and choose that of commemoration, (which is really higher,) yea, and should strongly insist upon it, and make it a point. They certainly do so, as may appear from their own writings [m]: and what is stranger still, they assign such odd reasons for it, that one would scarce think them in earnest, if we were to look no further. For what if St. Paul does speak of declaring, or shewing our Lord's death, may not *ἀνάμνησις* still signify remembrance? Is it not proper first to remember, and then to declare; or to declare it now, in order to remember for the future? Why should one exclude the other, when both are consistent, and suit well together? And though a person is supposed, before his coming to the holy Communion, to have the Lord's death in mind, confusely, or in the general, may he not still want to have it more in mind, and to remember it in particular, with all its circumstances, upon a close recollection, assisted by an external solemnity performed before his eyes? Besides, if we should not want to call it to mind, yet we may want to keep it in mind for the future: and who sees not how serviceable the sacramental solemnity may be for that very purpose? Add to this, that it is particularly said with respect

[m] 'Apparet, graviter errasse illos qui existimarunt verbum "commemorationem," quod in Graeco est *ἀνάμνησιν*, mutari debere in "recordationem:" neque enim dicit Paulus 'mortem Domini recordamini,' sed 'mortem Domini annuntiatis,' quod profecto non recordationem, sed commemorationem et praedicationem omnino significat . . . . non est quod quis ex verbo illo (*ἀνάμνησις*) colligat coenam Domini in eum finem institutam fuisse, ut nobis suggerat et in memoriam revocet mortem ipsius Domini . . . . Commemoratio autem ista, et praedicatio mortis Christi, id necessario conjunctum habet, ut gratiae agantur Christo, tum vero Deo, patri ejus, cujus mandato animam suam posuit.' Socin. de Usu et Fin. Coenae Domini, pp. 4, 5.

'Quod nonnulli per "commemorationem" in verbis Christi quibus ritum hunc instituit, "recordationem" intelligunt, vel hanc pro illa vocem reponunt, arbitrantes in eum finem ritum hunc sacrum esse institutum, ut nobis mortem Domini in memoriam revocet, in eo manifeste errant; quum qui ritum hunc sacrum obire recte velit, ac mortem Domini hac ratione annuntiare, eum Christi mortis probe et semper memorem esse oporteat.' Cracov. Catechism, sect. vi. cap. 4. p. 229. Cp. Schlichting. in 1 Cor. xi. 25. et contr. Meisner. pp. 805, 814, 816. Wolzogen. in Matt. xxvi. p. 416.

to the Passover, 'Thou shalt sacrifice the passover, &c., that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest out of Egypt, all the days of thy life[n].' Which is exactly parallel, so far, to the remembrance appointed in the Eucharist. How trifling would it be to urge, that the Israelites were supposed to remember the day before their coming to the Passover, and therefore could have no need to refresh their memories by coming; or to urge, that because they ought always to bear it in mind, therefore it could not be one end or use of the Passover, to remind them of it, or to keep it in remembrance all their days.

One may judge from hence, that Socinus's pretended reasons against the notion of remembrance were mere shuffle and pretence, carrying more of art and colouring in them, than of truth or sincerity: he had a turn to serve in favour of an hypothesis, and that was all. The turn was this: he had a mind to make the *ἀνάμνησις* (which is one end, or use, or part of the Sacrament) to be the whole of the Sacrament, its whole nature and essence, as I before hinted, and to interpret the words, 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood,' to mean, this bread and wine, or rather this action, is an *ἀνάμνησις*, a commemoration, and nothing more. He could not pretend to say, that this material thing, or this external action, is a remembrance, (which denotes an internal perception,) and therefore he substitutes commemoration in its stead, an outward act, and external service, and then resolves the whole of the Sacrament into that, confounding the end or use of the thing with the thing itself. This was his fetch; and so he hoped to be rid at once of all supposed present graces or benefits accruing to worthy receivers, making the sign and thing signified to be all one, and indeed to be sign only.

However, though Socinus had no good views in interpreting *ἀνάμνησις* by commemoration, and was undoubtedly wrong in excluding remembrance: yet setting aside his foreign fancies, it is very right to interpret the word by commemoration; but so as to include both an inward remembrance of benefits, and an outward celebration of the same, together with devout praises and

[n] Deut. xvi. 2, 3.

thanksgivings to Christ our Lord for them, and to all the three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity. It is scarce possible for a considerate devout mind to stop short in a bare remembrance, (though remembrance is always supposed, and is by this sacred solemnity reinforced,) but it will of course break out into thankful praises and adorations. We accept therefore of what Socinus and his brethren so much contend for, that the Greek ἀνάμνησις, in this case, does amount to a commemoration, and is better rendered by that word than by remembrance: because the word will bear it, and because the circumstances shew that remembrance alone, without commemoration superadded, is short of the idea intended by it.

I may further note, though it is but the natural and obvious consequence of what I have before said, that this commemoration must be understood in as high and as full a sense as the remembrance spoken of above: we must commemorate our Lord in a manner suitable to his Divine nature and dignity, and according to what he is by the Scripture accounts. We must commemorate him as God, purchasing the Church with his own blood [o]. We must commemorate his passion as St. Paul has done, and in like words with these: 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross [p].' In another place, the same Apostle, speaking of the 'redemption by the blood' of Christ, and of his making 'peace through the blood of the cross,' closes one, and ushers in the other, with a large account of the supereminent dignity of his Person, as born before the creation; adding, that 'all things were created by him, and for him, and by him consist [q].' This is the right way of celebrating or commemorating

[o] Acts xx. 28. For the reading of the text, see Mill. in loc. and Pearson on the Creed, p. 129, and Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. p. 213, and Pfaffius de Var. Lect. p. 161.

[p] Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8. See my fifth Sermon, vol. ii., Second Defence, vol. ii. p. 548, and Third Defence, vol. iii. p. 59.

[q] Coloss. i. 14-20. Compare my Sermons, vol. ii. pp. 56, &c. 103, &c.

his passion, as it is declaring the infinite value of it. To speak of him only as man, or as a creature, though otherwise in a devout way, is not honouring, but dishonouring him and his sufferings; is not commemorating, but blaspheming his name. St. Paul, in another place, going to speak of our Lord's passion, introduces it with a previous description of his personal dignity: 'appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his Person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high[r].' But as remarkable a passage as any is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the Apostle, to enhance the value of Christ's sufferings, expresses himself thus: 'If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God[s]?' By eternal Spirit, I understand Christ's Divine nature, as the most judicious interpreters do[t]: and so from hence it is plain how the merit of Christ's sufferings rises in proportion to the dignity of the Person; and it is the Divinity that stamps the value upon the suffering humanity. And hence also it is that St. John so emphatically observes, that it is the blood of Jesus Christ his Son (that Son whom the Apostle everywhere describes under the most lofty characters, as particularly John i.) which 'cleanseth us from all sin[u].' Such is the Scripture way of commemorating our Lord and his passion, and such the way of all the ancient churches of God: be this our pattern, as it ought to be for our commemorations in the holy Communion.

III. But I observed, that there was a third or a fourth rendering of the same words, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν: 'for a memorial of me;' or, 'for my memorial,' which is more strictly literal. This rendering is not much different from the two former, but contains and includes both: for a memorial supposes and takes in both

[r] Heb. i. 2, 3. Wolfius in loc. [s] Heb. ix. 13, 14. [t] See Bull, Opp. p. 19, and [u] 1 John i. 7.

a remembrance and a commemoration. Whether it superadds anything to them, and makes the idea still larger or fuller, is the question. If it carries in it any tacit allusion to the sacrificial memorials of the Old Testament, it may then be conceived to add to the idea of commemoration the idea of acceptable and well pleasing, viz. to Almighty God. I build not upon *ἀνάμνησις* being twice used in the Septuagint as the name for a sacrificial memorial [x]; for the usual sense of the word, in the same Septuagint, is different, having no relation to sacrifice: but thus far may be justly pleaded, from the nature and reason of the thing, that the service of the Eucharist (the most proper part of evangelical worship, and most solemn religious act of the Christian Church) must be understood to ascend up 'for a memorial before God,' in as strict a sense, at least, as Cornelius's alms and prayers were said so to do [y]; or as the 'prayers of the saints' go up as sweet odours, mystical incense [z], before God. Indeed, the incense and sacrificial memorials of the Old Testament were mostly typical of evangelical worship or Christian services, and were acceptable to God under that view; and therefore it cannot be doubted but the true rational incense, viz. Gospel services, rightly performed, (and among these more especially the Eucharistical service,) are the acceptable memorials in God's sight. Whether there was any such allusion intended in the name *ἀνάμνησις*, when our Lord recommended the observance of the Eucharist as his memorial, cannot be certainly determined, since the name might carry in it such an allusion, or might be without it; but as to the thing, that such worship rightly performed has the force and value of any memorial elsewhere mentioned in Scripture (sacrificial or other) cannot be doubted; and the rest is not worth disputing, or would make too large a digression in this place.

Before I dismiss the word *ἀνάμνησις*, it may not be improper to note, that it occurs but once more in the New Testament, where St. Paul speaks of the 'commemoration of sins [a],' made once a year,

[x] Levit. xxiv. 7. Numb. x. 21.

[y] Acts x. 4.

[z] Rev. v. 8; viii. 3, 4. Psalm cxli. 2. Compare Malach. i. 11. Vid. Vitringa, in Apocalyps. pp. 214, &c. 333, &c. Dodwell, Incensing no Apostolical Tradition, pp. 36, 37, 38.

[a] *Ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν.* Heb. x. 3.

under the Old Testament, on the great day of expiation; when the High Priest was to 'confess all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins [b].' There was *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν*, commemoration of sins: but under the Gospel it is happily changed into *ἀνάμνησις τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, commemoration of Christ. There sins were remembered; here forgiveness of sins: a remarkable privilege of the Gospel economy above the legal. Not but that there was forgiveness also under the Old Testament, legal and external forgiveness by the law, and mystical forgiveness under the law, by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ foreordained, and foreshadowed: but under the Gospel, forgiveness is clearly and without a figure declared, and for all sins repented of; and there is no remembrance of them more [c]; no commemoration of them by legal sacrifices, but instead thereof a continual commemoration of Christ's sacrifice for the 'remission of sins,' in the Christian Sacraments. There must indeed be confession of sins, and forsaking them also under the Gospel dispensation: but then it is without the burden of ritual expiations and ceremonial atonements: for the many and grievous sacrifices are all converted into one easy (and to every good man delightful) commemoration of the all-sufficient sacrifice in the holy Communion. But I return.

Hitherto I have been considering the Eucharistical commemoration as a memorial before God, which is the highest view of it: but I must not omit to take notice, that it is a memorial also before men, in the same sense as the paschal service was. Of the Passover it is said: 'This day shall be unto you for a memorial, and you shall keep it a feast to the Lord [d].' It is here called a feast to the Lord, and a memorial to the people: not but that it was a memorial also to the Lord, in the large sense of memorial before mentioned, (as every pious and grateful acknowledgment to God for mercies received is). But in the stricter sense of memorial, it was such only to the people. It is further said in the same chapter, of the paschal service: 'Ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever. . . . And when your children shall say unto you, What

[b] Vid. Levit. xvi. 21. [c] Jer. xxxi. 34. [d] Exod. xii. 14.

mean you by this service? ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses[e].' And in the next chapter[f]: 'It shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth,' &c. In such a sense as this, the service of the Eucharist is a memorial left to the Church of Christ, to perpetuate the memory of that great deliverance from the bondage of sin and Satan (of which the former deliverance from Egyptian bondage was but a type) to all succeeding generations. By this solemn service, besides other uses, God has admirably provided for the bulk of mankind, that they may be constantly and visibly reminded of what it so much concerns them both to know and attend to. It is to the illiterate instead of books, and answers the purpose better than a thousand monitors without it might do. Jesus Christ is hereby 'set forth crucified[g],' as it were, before their eyes, in order to make the stronger impression.

I may further observe, that as all the Passovers, after the first, were a kind of representations and commemorations of that original[h], so all our Eucharistical Passovers are a sort of commemorations of the original Eucharist. Which I the rather take notice of, because I find an ancient Father, (if we may depend upon a Fragment,) Hippolytus, who was a disciple of Irenaeus, representing the thing in that view: for commenting on Prov. ix. 2, 'Wisdom hath furnished her table,' he writes thus: 'Namely, the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity; and also his precious and undefiled body and blood, which are daily administered at the mystical and sacred table, sacrificed for a memorial of that ever memorable and original table of the mystical Divine Supper[i].' Upon which words I may remark, by the way, that here is mention made of the body and blood as

[e] Exod. xii. 24, 26, 27.
[f] Exod. xiii. 9. Compare Deut. xvi. 3.
[g] Gal. iii. 1.
[h] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 44.
[i] Καὶ ἡτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν· τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος κατεπαγγελλομένην. Καὶ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ καὶ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελοῦνται, θυόμενα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀειμνήστου καὶ πρώτης ἐκείνης τοῦ μυστικοῦ θείου δείπνου. Hippolyt. vol. i. p. 282, ed. Fabric.

sacrificed in the Eucharist twenty or thirty years before Cyprian, if the Fragment be certainly Hippolytus's, and then it is the earliest in its kind, though not higher than the third century. As to his making all succeeding Eucharists memorials of the first, the notion interferes not with their being memorials also of our Lord and his passion, as before explained, but all the several views will hang well together.

Thus far I have been considering the Christian Eucharist as a remembrance, and a commemoration, and a memorial of Christ our Lord. I could not avoid intermixing something here and there of our Lord's death and passion, which have so close an affinity with the subject of this chapter: nevertheless that article may require a more distinct consideration, and therefore it may be proper to have a separate chapter for it.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Commemoration of the Death of our Lord made in the Holy Communion.

IT is not sufficient to commemorate the death of Christ, without considering what his death means, what were the moving reasons for it, and what its ends and uses. The subtilties of Socinus and his followers have made this inquiry necessary: for it is to very little purpose 'to shew the Lord's death till he come,' by the service of the Eucharist, if we acknowledge not that Lord which the Scriptures set forth, nor that death which the New Testament teaches. As to Lord, who and what he is, I have said what I conceived sufficient, in the preceding chapter: and now I am to say something of that death which he suffered, as a willing sacrifice to Divine Justice for the sins of mankind. It is impossible that a man should come worthily to the holy Communion, while he perverts the prime ends and uses of the sacrifice there commemorated, and sets up a righteousness of his own, independent of it, frustrating the grace of God in Christ, and making him to have 'died in vain[j].'

[j] 'Quidam vero, quomodo aliquando Judaei, et Christianos se dici volunt, et adhuc ignorantes Dei justitiam suam volunt constituere, etiam

The death of Christ, by the Scripture account, was properly a vicarious punishment of sin, a true and proper expiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind: and therefore it ought to be remembered as such, in the memorial we make of it at the Lord's table. I shall cite some texts, just to give the reader a competent notion of the Scripture doctrine in this article; though indeed the thing is so plain, and so frequently inculcated, from one end of the Scriptures to the other, that no man (one would think) who is not previously disposed to deceive himself, or has imbibed strong prejudices, could either reject it or misconceive it.

1. That the sufferings of Christ had the nature of punishments, rather than of mere calamities, is proved from what is said by the Prophet Isaiah, as follows: 'He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows....He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.... The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all....For the transgression of my people was he stricken....When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, &c. He was numbered with the transgressors, and bare the sins of many [k].' What can all these words mean, if they amount not to punishment for the sins of mankind? Evasions have been invented, and they have been often refuted.

To the same purpose we read in the New Testament, that 'he was delivered for our offences [l],' that he 'died for all,' was 'made sin for us,' when he 'knew no sin [m];' 'was made a curse for us [n],' 'died for our sins [o],' 'gave himself for our sins [p],' 'tasted death for every man [q],' and the like. To interpret these and other such texts of dying for our advantage, without relation to sin and the penalty due to it, is altogether forced and un-

temporibus nostris, temporibus apertae gratiae, &c.... Quod ait Apostolus de lege, hoc nos istis dicimus de natura; si per naturam justitia, ergo Christus gratis mortuus est.' Augustin. Serm. xiii. in Johan. vi. Opp. tom. v. pp. 645, 646, edit. Bened.

[k] Isa. liii. 4-12: cp. Outram de Sacrific. pp. 319, &c.-328. 1 Pet. ii. 24, and Outram, p. 329, &c.

[l] Rom. iv. 25.

[m] 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21. John xi. 50, 51, 52.

[n] Gal. iii. 13.

[o] 1 Cor. xv. 3.

[p] Gal. i. 4.

[q] Heb. ii. 9.

natural, contrary to the custom of language, and to the obvious import of very plain words.

2. That our blessed Lord was in his death a proper expiatory sacrifice, (if ever there was any,) is as plain from the New Testament as words can make it. He gave 'his life a ransom for many[r],' was 'the Lamb of God' which was to 'take away the sins of the world[s],' 'died for the ungodly[t],' 'gave himself a ransom for all[u],' once 'suffered for sins, the just for the unjust[x],' 'gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour[y].' 'Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us[z],' 'offered up himself[a],' 'to bear the sins of many[b],' has 'put away sin by the sacrifice of himself[c].' We have been 'redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot[d].' These are not mere allusions to the sacrifices of the Old Testament, but they are interpretative of them, declaring their typical nature, as prefiguring the grand sacrifice, and centering in it: which, besides other considerations, appears very evidently from the whole design and tenor of the Epistle to the Hebrews; signifying, that the legal sacrifices were allusions to, and prefigurations of, the grand sacrifice.

3. That from this sacrifice, and by virtue of it, we receive the benefit of atonement, redemption, propitiation, justification, reconciliation, remission, &c., is no less evident from abundance of places in the New Testament. 'Through our Lord Jesus Christ we have received the atonement,' and 'we are reconciled to God by his death[e].' 'Him God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood[f].' 'He is the propitiation for our sins,—for the sins of the whole world[g].' 'We are justified by his blood[h],' 'redeemed to God by his blood[i],' 'cleansed from all sin by his blood[k],' 'washed from our sins in his blood[l];' and the robes of the saints are washed and made white only in the

[r] Matt. xx. 28. [s] John i. 29. [t] Rom. v. 6. [u] 1 Tim. ii. 6. [x] 1 Pet. iii. 18; compare ii. 21; iv. 1. [y] Ephes. v. 2. [z] 1 Cor. v. 7. [a] Heb. vii. 27; x. 12; ix. 14. [b] Heb. ix. 28. [c] Heb. ix. 26; compare x. 12. [d] 1 Pet. i. 19. [e] Rom. v. 10, 11. [f] Rom. iii. 25. [g] 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10. [h] Rom. v. 9. [i] Rev. v. 9. [k] 1 John i. 7. [l] Rev. i. 5.

blood of the Lamb [m]. By himself he 'purged our sins [n],' viz. when he shed his blood upon the cross: and our redemption is through his blood [o]. He hath reconciled us to God by the cross [p], 'in the body of his flesh through death [q].' 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them [r].' His blood was 'shed for many, for the remission of sins [s],' 'and without shedding of blood is no remission [t].' It is this 'blood of sprinkling' that 'speaketh better things than the blood of Abel [u]:' and it is by the 'blood of Jesus' that men must enter into 'the holiest [v],' as many as enter. I have thrown these texts together without note or comment; for they need none, they interpret themselves. Let but the reader observe, with what variety of expression this great truth is inculcated, that our salvation chiefly stands in the meritorious sufferings of our Saviour Christ. The consideration whereof made St. Paul say, 'I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified [x]:' namely, because this was a most essential article, the very sum and substance of the Gospel. 'In these and in a great many more passages that lie spread in all the parts of the New Testament, it is as plain as words can make anything, that the death of Christ is proposed to us as our sacrifice and reconciliation, our atonement and redemption. So it is not possible for any man, that considers all this, to imagine that Christ's death was only a confirmation of his Gospel, a pattern of a holy and patient suffering of death, and a necessary preparation to his resurrection.... By this all the high commendations of his death amount only to this, that he by dying has given a vast credit and authority to his Gospel, which was the powerfullest mean possible to redeem us from sin, and to reconcile us to God. But this is so contrary to the whole design of the New Testament, and to the true importance of that great variety of phrases, in which this matter is set out, that at this rate of expounding Scripture we can

[m] Rev. vii. 14. [n] Heb. i. 3. [o] Ephesians i. 7; compare 1 Corinthians vi. 20; Coloss. i. 14. [p] Eph. ii. 16. [q] Coloss. i. 22. [r] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. [s] Matt. xxvi. 28. [t] Heb. ix. 22. [u] Heb. xii. 24. [v] Heb. x. 19. [x] 1 Cor. ii. 2.

never know what we may build upon; especially when the great importance of this thing, and of our having right notions concerning it, is well considered [y].'

The least that we can infer from the texts above mentioned is, that there is some very particular virtue, merit, efficacy, in the death of Christ, that God's acceptance of sinners, though penitent, (not perfect,) depended entirely upon it. Common sacrifices could never 'make the comers thereunto perfect [z]:' but it was absolutely necessary that the heavenly things should be purified with some better sacrifice [a]. Which is so true, that our Lord is represented as entering into the holy of holies (that is heaven) 'by his own blood [b],' where 'he ever liveth to make intercession for' those that 'come unto God by him [c].' The efficacy even of his intercession above (great and powerful as he is) yet depends chiefly upon that circumstance, his having entered thither by 'his own blood;' that is to say, upon the merit of his death and passion, and the atonement thereby made. His intercession belongs to his priestly office, and that supposes the offering before made: for there was a necessity that he should 'have somewhat to offer [d],' and nothing less than himself [e]. Seeing therefore that, in order to our redemption, Christ suffered as a piacular victim, (which must be understood to be in our stead,) and that there was some necessity he should do so, and that his prevailing intercession at God's right hand now, and to the end of the world, stands upon that ground, and must do so; what can we think less, but that some very momentous reasons of justice or of government (both which resolve at length into one) required that so it should be. We are not indeed competent judges of all the reasons or measures of an all-wise God, with respect to his dealings with his creatures; neither are we able to argue, as it were, beforehand, with sufficient certainty,

[y] Bishop Burnet on Article II. pp. 70, 71. [z] Heb. x. 1. [a] Ib. ix. 23.

[b] Heb. ix. 12. Note, it is not only said that Christ entered into heaven by his own blood, but he is there also considered as the Lamb slain: Rev. v. 6. Which further shews wherein principally the virtue of his intercession consists.

[c] Heb. vii. 25; cp. Rom. viii. 33, 34. Heb. ii. 17; ix. 24. 1 John ii. 2.

[d] Heb. viii. 3; v. 1.

[e] Heb. ix. 14, 25, 26, 28; compare i. 3.

about the terms of acceptance, which his wisdom, or his holiness, or his justice, might demand. But we ought to take careful heed to what he has said, and what he has done, and to draw the proper conclusions from both. One thing is plain, from the terms of the first covenant, made in Paradise, that Divine wisdom could have admitted man perfectly innocent to perfect happiness, without the intervention of any sacrifice, or any Mediator: and it is no less plain, from the terms of the new covenant, that there was some necessity (fixed in the very reason and nature of things) that a valuable consideration, atonement, or sacrifice, should be offered, to make fallen man capable of eternal glory [f]. The truth of the thing done proves its necessity, (besides what I have alleged from express Scripture concerning such necessity,) for it is not imaginable that so great a thing would have been done upon earth, and afterwards, as it were, constantly commemorated in heaven [g], if there had not been very strong and pressing reasons for it, and such as made it as necessary, (in the Divine counsels,) as it was necessary for a God of infinite perfection to be wise and holy, just and good. When I said constantly commemorated in heaven, I had an eye to Christ's continual intercession [h], which is a kind of commemoration of the sacrifice which he once offered upon the cross, and is always pleading the merit of. Which shews still of what exceeding great moment that sacrifice was, for the reconciling the acceptance of sinful men with the ends of Divine government, the manifestation of Divine glory, and the unalterable perfection of the Divine attributes. And if that

[f] 'Si non fuisset peccatum, non necesse fuerat Filium Dei agnum fieri, nec opus fuerat eum in carne positum jugulari, sed mansisset hoc quod in principio erat, Deus verbum: verum quoniam intravit peccatum in hunc mundum, peccati autem necessitas propitiationem requirit, et propitiatio non fit nisi per hostiam, necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato.' Orig. in Num. Hom. xxiv. p. 362.

[g] 'Est ergo duplex, ut legalium quarundam victimarum, ita Christi oblatio, prior mactationis, altera ostentionis legalium victimarum; prior peracta in templo, altera in ipso penetrali: Christi prior in terris, posterior in caelo. Prior tamen illa non sacrificii praeparatio, sed sacrificium: posterior non tam sacrificium, quam sacrificii facti commemoratio.' Grot. de Satisfact. in fine.

[h] 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, (which are the figures of the true); but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' Heb. ix. 24.

sacrifice is represented and pleaded in heaven by Christ himself, for remission of sins, that shews that there is an intrinsic virtue, value, merit in it, for the purposes intended: and it shews further, how rational and how proper our Eucharistical service is, as commemorating the same sacrifice here below, which our Lord himself commemorates above. God may reasonably require of us this humble acknowledgment, this self-abasement, that after we have done our best, we are offenders still, though penitent offenders, and have not done all that we ought to have done; and that therefore we can claim nothing in virtue of our own righteousness considered by itself, separate from the additional virtue of that all-sufficient sacrifice, which alone can render even our best services accepted [i].

If it should be objected, that we have a covenant claim by the Gospel, and that that covenant was entirely owing to Divine mercy, and that so we resolve not our right and title into any strict merits of our own, but into the pure mercy of God, and that this suffices without any respect to a sacrifice: I say, if this should be pleaded, I answer that no such covenant claim appears, separate from all respect to a sacrifice. The covenant is that persons so and so qualified shall be acceptable in and through Christ, and by virtue of that very sacrifice which he entered with into the holy of holies, and by which he now intercedes and appears for us. Besides, it is not right to think nor is it modest or pious to say, that in the economy of every man's salvation, the groundwork only is God's, by settling the covenant, and the finishing part ours, by performing the conditions; but the true order or method is for our Lord to be both the Author and Finisher of the whole. The covenant, or rather, the covenant charter, was given soon after the fall to mankind in general, and has been carried on through successive generations by new stipulating acts in every age: so likewise was the atonement made (or considered as made) once for all, but is applied to particulars, or individuals, continually, by means of Christ's constant abiding intercession. Therefore it is not barely

[i] See our XIth Article, with Bishop Burnet's Notes upon it, and Mr. Welchman's.

our performing the conditions, that finishes our salvation, but it is our Lord's applying his merits to our performances that finishes all. Perhaps this whole matter may be more clearly represented by a distinct enumeration of the several concurring means to the same end. 1. The Divine philanthropy has the first hand in our salvation, is the primary or principal cause. 2. Our performing the duties required, faith and repentance, by the aid of Divine grace, is the conditional cause. 3. The sacrifice of Christ's death, recommending and rendering acceptable our imperfect performances, is the meritorious cause. 4. The Divine ordinances, and more particularly the two Sacraments, (so far as distinct from conditional,) are the instrumental [k] causes, in and by which God applies to men fitly disposed the virtue of that sacrifice. Let these things be supposed only, at present, for clearer conception: proofs of everything will appear in due time and place. By this account may be competently understood the end and use of commemorating the sacrifice of our Lord's passion in the holy Communion. It corresponds with the commemoration made above: it is suing for pardon, in virtue of the same plea that Christ himself sues in, on our behalf: it is acknowledging our indispensable need of it, and our dependence upon it; and confessing all our other righteousness to be as nothing without it. In a word, it is at once a service of thanksgiving (to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) for the sacrifice of our redemption, and a service also of self-humiliation before God, angels, and men.

If it should be objected here, that shewing forth our Lord's death, cannot well be understood of shewing to God, who wants not to have anything shewn to him, all things being naked before him; it is obvious to reply, that he permits and commands us, in innumerable instances, to present ourselves and our addresses before him: and though the very word *καταγγέλλειν*, which St. Paul makes use of in this case [l], is not elsewhere used for shewing to God, yet *ἀναγγέλλειν*, a word of like import, is [m];

[k] I understand 'instrument' here in no other sense, but as deeds of conveyance, or forms of investiture, such as a ring, a crosier, letters patent, broad seal, and the like, are called instruments: which shall be explained hereafter.

[l] 1 Cor. xi. 26. Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε.

[m] Ἀναγγέλλω σήμερον Κυρίῳ τῷ

so that there is no just objection to be drawn merely from the phraseology. As to the reason of the thing, since addresses to God have always gone along with the representation made in the Communion, and are part of the commemoration, it must be understood that we represent what we do represent, to God, as well as to men.

Having thus despatched what I intended concerning the remembrance, commemoration, or memorial of our Lord, and of his passion, made in this Sacrament, I might now proceed to a new chapter. But there is an incidental point or two to be discussed, which seem to fall in our way, and which therefore I shall here briefly consider, before I go further.

1. It has been suggested by some[n], that the notion of remembrance, or commemoration, in this service, is an argument against present receiving of benefits in, or by it: Christ and his benefits are to be remembered or commemorated here; therefore neither he nor his benefits are supposed to be actually received at the time. This is not the place proper for examining the question about present or actual benefits: but it may be proper, while we are stating the notion of remembrance, to obviate an objection drawn from it, in order to clear our way so far. I see no force at all in the argument, unless it could be proved that the word remembrance must always be referred to something past or absent: which is a supposition not warranted by the customary use of language. 'Remember thy Creator:' does it follow, that the Creator is not present? 'Remember the Sabbath day' (when present, I suppose) 'to keep it holy.' Let remembrance signify calling to mind[o]; may we not call to mind present

Θεῷ μοῦ. κ.τ.λ. Deut. xxvi. 3. Cp. Psal. xxxviii. 18.

[n] 'Jam constat homines ibi non participare, vel sortiri, vel accipere sanguinem Christi: participatio enim, vel sortitio, rei praesentis est; at benedictio, quae hoc loco idem est quod commemoratio, rei praeteritae esse solet.' Smalc. contr. Frantz. p. 331.

'Notandum recordationem rebus vere et realiter praesentibus nullo modo tribui posse: non enim dici possumus eorum recordari quibus tunc cum maxime praesentibus fruimur, quum recordatio mere ad praeterita pertineat.' Przipcovius ad 1 Cor. xi. 20, p. 91.

[o] Archbishop Tillotson, explaining the Scripture notion of remembrance, says: 'Remembrance is the actual thought of what we do habitually know. . . . To remember a person, or thing, is to call them to mind upon

benefits, which are invisible, and which easily slip out of our thoughts, or perhaps rarely occur, being thrust out by sensible things? Or let it signify keeping in mind; if so, there is no impropriety in saying, that we keep in mind what is present and not seen, by the help of what is seen. Let it signify commemorating: may not a man commemorate a benefaction, suppose, which is in some sense past, but is present also in its abiding fruits and influences, which are the strongest motives for commemorating the same? Indeed it would be hard to vindicate the wisdom of commemorating what is past or absent, were there not some present benefits resulting from it. I presume, if a benefaction were wholly lost or sunk, the usual commemoration of it would soon sink with it: the present benefits are what keep it up. We do not say that Christ's death, or Christ's crucifixion, is now present; we know it is past: but the benefits remain; and while we remember one as past, we call to mind, or keep in mind, the other also, as present, but invisible, and therefore easily overlooked. I see no impropriety in this manner of speaking: nor if a person should be exhorted to remember that he has a soul to be saved, that such an admonition would imply, that his soul is absent from his body.

2. Another incidental question, like the former, is whether, from the notion of remembrance in this sacrament, a conclusive argument may be formed against the corporal presence, and particularly against transubstantiation? Notwithstanding that we have many clear demonstrations against that strange doctrine, yet I should be far from rejecting any additional argument, provided it were solid and just: but I perceive not of what use the word remembrance can be in this case, or how any certain argument can be drawn from it. The words are 'remembrance of me:' therefore, if any absence can be proved from thence, it must be the absence of what ME there stands for, that is, of the

all proper and fitting occasions, to think actually of them, so as to do that which the remembrance of them does require, or prompt us to.' Serm. liv. p. 638. fol. edit.

I see not why present benefits may not thus be remembered, and deserve to be so, rather than past, or absent, or distant benefits.

whole person of Christ; and so it appears as conclusive against a spiritual presence, as against a corporal one, and proves too much to prove anything. Surely we may remember Christ, in strict propriety of expression, and yet believe him to be present at the same time; especially considering that he is 'always present with his Church, even to the end of the world[p],' and that 'where two or three are gathered together in his name, there' is he 'in the midst of them[q];' and he has often told us of his dwelling in good men. So then, since it is not said, remembrance of my body, but remembrance of me, and since it is certain, that one part at least of what ought to be remembered is present, (not absent,) therefore no argument can be justly drawn merely from the word remembrance, as necessarily inferring the absence of the thing remembered.

But if it had been said, remembrance of my body, or blood, yet neither so would the argument be conclusive, if we attend strictly to the Romish persuasion. For they do not assert any visible presence of Christ's body or blood, but they say, that his natural body and blood are invisibly, or in a spiritual manner, present, under the accidents, or visible appearances of bread and wine. Now what is invisible is so far imperceptible, unless by the eye of faith, and wants as much to be called to mind as any absent thing whatsoever. Therefore remembrance, or calling to mind, might be very proper in this case: for what is out of sight may easily slip out of mind.

If any particular restrained sense of remembrance should be thought on, to help out the argument; there will still remain a great difficulty, namely, to prove that *ἀνάμνησις*, in the words of the institution, must necessarily be confined to such a restrained sense: which being utterly uncapable of any certain proof, the argument built thereupon must of consequence fall to the ground. Seeing, therefore, that there are two very considerable flaws in the argument, as proving too much one way, and too little the other way, it appears not prudent to rest an otherwise clear clause upon so precarious a bottom, or to give the Romanists a

[p] Matt. xxviii. 20.

[q] Matt. xviii. 20.

very needless handle for triumph in this article, when we have a multitude of other arguments, strong and irresistible, against the corporal or local presence in the holy Communion.

As to the continuance of the Eucharistical service till our Lord comes, there is a plain reason for it, because the Christian dispensation is bound up in it, and must expire with it. And there is no necessity for supposing, as some do[r], any allusion to the absence of his body. The text does not say, till his body appears, but till he come: that is, till he comes to put an end to this sacramental service, (and to all other services proper to a state of probation,) and to assign us our reward. The reference is to the ultimate end, where this and all other probationary duties, as such, must cease, and to which they now look, expecting to be so crowned and completed: so that if there be an antithesis intended in the words, it is between present service and future glory, not between present and absent body.

However, though the argument will not bear in the view before mentioned, yet it is right and just to argue, that the sign, or memorial of anything, is not the very thing signified or commemorated, but is distinct from it. Bread and wine, the symbols of Christ's natural body and blood, are not literally that very natural body and blood; neither is the sacrament of Christ's passion literally the passion itself: thus far we may argue justly against transubstantiation, but supposing at the same time the strict sense of the word Sacrament to be the true one. The argument is as good against the Socinians also, only by being transversed: for the things signified and commemorated are not the signs or memorials, but something else. And therefore, to make out the true notion of sacramental signs, there must be inward and invisible graces as well as outward visible signs: of which more in the sequel.

Having done with the first and principal end of the Sacrament, namely, the commemoration of Christ as described in Scripture,

[r] 'Quia futuri adventus Domini mentio sit, palam est, quasi absentis desiderium, et, ut ita dicam, defectum suppleri, hac repraesentatione et ob oculos positione praeteriti ejus beneficii, donec ipse adveniens desiderium hoc nostrum impleat.' Przipcovius ad 1 Cor. xi. 24.

and of his death according to the true sacrificial notion of it; I now proceed to shew how this commemoration is performed, or by what kind of service it is solemnized, and what is further intimated or effected in and by that service.

CHAP. V.

Of the Consecration of the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion.

THE first thing we have to take notice of in the Sacramental service is the consecration of the elements: 'Jesus took bread and blessed it[s].' 'The cup of blessing which we bless[t],' &c. Here the points to be inquired into are: 1. Whether the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist are really blessed, consecrated, sanctified, and in what sense. 2. Supposing they are blessed, &c., by whom or how they are so. 3. What the blessing or consecration amounts to.

1. The first inquiry is, whether the elements may be justly said to be blessed or consecrated: for this is a point which I find disputed by some; not many, nor very considerable. Smalcius, a warm man, and who seldom knew any bounds, seems to have been of opinion, that no proper, no sacerdotal benediction at all belonged to the bread and cup before receiving, nor indeed after; but that the communicants, upon receiving the elements, gave praise to God, and that was all the benediction which St. Paul speaks of[u]. So he denies that any benediction at all passed to the elements. And he asserts besides, that whatever benediction there was, it was not so much from the administrator, or officiating minister, as from the communicants themselves: for which he has a weak pretence from St. Paul's words, 'we bless,' that is, says he, we communicants do it. Thus far Smalcius. But the cooler and wiser Socinians go not these lengths. Crellius

[s] Matt. xxvi. 26. [t] 1 Cor. x. 16.

[u] 'Notandum insuper est, verba Pauli, 'calix benedictionis,' non significare calicem benedictum (ut Frantzius, una cum Pontificiis, aliquid divinum sibi et suis hac re arroganti-bus, interpretatur) sed calicem quo sumpto benedicimus: mox enim additur, 'quem benedicimus,' nempe omnes qui ad mensam Domini accedimus.' Valent. Smal. contr. Frantz. p. 331.

expressly allows, that a benediction is conferred upon the cup, as it is sanctified by thanksgiving, and made a kind of libation unto God [x]. He goes further, and distinguishes sacramental consecration from that of common meals, as amounting to a sanctification of the elements for high and sacred purposes [y]. The Racovian Catechism allows also of a sanctification of the elements, made by prayer and thanksgiving [z]. Wolzogenius, afterwards, seems to waver and fluctuate between inclination and reason, and scarce knows where to fix; sometimes admitting a consecration of the elements, and soon after resolving all into bare giving of thanks to God [a]. I suppose all his hesitancy was owing to his not understanding the notion of relative holiness, (which he might have admitted, as Crellius did, consistently with his other principles,) or to some apprehension he was under, lest the admitting of a real sanctification should infer some secret operation of the Holy Ghost. However, to make Scripture bend to any preconceived opinions is not treating sacred Writ with the reverence which belongs to it. St. Paul is express, that the cup, meaning the wine, is blessed, or sanctified, in the Eucharist: and if the wine be really sanctified in that solemn service, no man of tolerable capacity can make any question as to the bread, whether that be not sanctified also.

It is of small moment to plead that εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν are often used promiscuously, and that the former properly

[x] 'Benedictio autem ista refertur primum ad Deum et Christum, et in gratiarum actione (unde etiam hic ritus antiquitus Eucharistiae nomen obtinuit) consistit: sed simul etiam transit ad calicem, quatenus divini nominis benedictione et gratiarum actione sanctificatur calix iste, et sic Domino quodammodo libatur.' Crellius in 1 Cor. x. 16. Opp. tom. ii. p. 306.

[y] 'Non tantum eam gratiarum actionem, quae etiam in vulgari ciborum et potus usu adhibetur, intelligi arbitramur, qua scilicet gratiae aguntur pro poculo isto; sed maxime eam qua gratiae aguntur pro Christi fuso pro nobis sanguine. Hac enim gratiarum actione imprimis poculum istud, quo ad Christi sanguinis fusionem repraesentandam utimur, sanctificatur et consecratur.' Crellius, ibid. p. 306.

[z] 'Qui calici huic benedicunt, id est, cum gratiarum actione, et nominis Domini celebratione sanctificant,' &c. Racov. Catech. sect. vi. c. 4. p. 237. edit. 1659.

[a] 'Vox benedicendi .... significat usitatam illam gratiarum actionem, seu consecrationem panis, &c. .... Calicem benedicere est, Deum pro potu, qui est in calice, extollere, eique gratias agere.' Wolzog. in Matt. xxvi. 26. p. 408.

signifies giving thanks, and that bread and wine (for thus do some trifle) cannot be thanked: for since the words are often used promiscuously, and since εὐλογεῖν is taken transitively in this very case by the Apostle [b], it is next to self-evident that εὐχαριστεῖν, so far as concerns this matter, cannot be taken in a sense exclusive of that transitive signification of εὐλογεῖν: for to do that is flatly to contradict the Apostle. No doubt but either of the words may (as circumstances happen) signify no more than thanking or praising God; but here it is manifest, that, in this rite, both God is praised and the elements blessed: yea both are done at the same time, and in the self-same act; and the Apostle's authority, without anything more, abundantly proves it. If the reader desires anything further, in so plain a case, he may please to consult three very able judges of Biblical language, or of Greek phrases; Buxtorf I mean, and Vorstius, and Casaubon, who have clearly and fully settled the true meaning of εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν, both in the general, and with respect to this particular case: I shall refer [c] to the two first of them, and shall cite a few words from the third [d]. But to cut off all pretence drawn from the strict sense of εὐχαριστεῖν, as importing barely thanksgiving unto God, it may be observed, that that word also is often used transitively [e], as well as εὐλογεῖν, and then it imports or includes benediction: so far from truth is it, that it must necessarily exclude it. I may further add, that the

[b] 1 Cor. x. 16. Τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν.

[c] Buxtorf. de Coena Domini, p. 311. Cp. Bucher. Antiq. Evangel. p. 369. Johan. Vorstius de Hebraism. N. T. part. i. p. 166, &c.

[d] 'Evangelistae et Apostolus Paulus ... duobus verbis promiscue utuntur, ad declarandam Domini actionem, εὐλογεῖν, et εὐχαριστεῖν ... utraque vox a parte una, totam Domini actionem designat: nam Christus in eodem actu, et Deum Patrem laudavit, et gratias ei egit, et hoc amplius panem sanctificavit; hoc est, consecravit in usum Sacramenti,' &c. Casaub. Exercit. xvi. p. 517. Cp. p. 533, and Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. 4. p. 8, &c.

[e] Εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου ... εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. Justin Mart. Apol. i. p. 96. cp. 98. ποτήρια εὐχαριστεῖν .... τοῦ (ποτηρίου) εὐχαριστημένου. Iren. lib. i. c. 13. p. 60. ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 375.

Note, that for the expressing this transitive sense of the Greek word, some have contrived, not improperly, the English word eucharistize, importing thanksgiving towards God, but so as at the same time to express the benediction imparted to the elements in the same act.

benedictions used [f] in the paschal solemnity may be an useful comment upon the benediction in the Eucharist. There the laying hand upon the bread, and the taking up the cup, were significant intimations of a blessing transferred to the bread and wine, in virtue of the thanksgiving service at the same time performed. And by the way, from hence may be understood what St. Chrysostom observes upon 1 Cor. x. 16, 'The cup of blessing which we bless,' &c., on which he thus comments: 'He called it the cup of blessing, because while we hold it in our hands, we send up our hymns of praise to God, struck with admiration and astonishment at the ineffable gift,' &c. [g] That circumstance of holding the thing in hand while the prayers or praises were offering, was supposed to signify the derivation of a benediction, or consecration upon it. It is not material to dispute, whether the consecration formerly was performed by thanksgiving, or by prayer, or by both together: the forms might differ in different churches, or at different times. But the point which we are now considering is, whether a benediction is really conveyed to the elements in this service, and whether they are really sanctified, or made holy. That they are so, is plain from the testimony of St. Paul before recited.

2. As to Smalcius's pretence, before mentioned, concerning the benediction of the communicants, after their receiving the elements, it is a groundless fiction, and a violent perverting of the plain meaning of the text. In the paschal service, the benediction was performed by the master of the feast, (not by the whole company,) and before distribution: so was it likewise in the institution of this sacrament by our Lord. And all antiquity

[f] See above, chap. ii. p. 43.

[g] *Ποτήριον δὲ εὐλογίας ἐκάλεσεν, ἐπειδὰν αὐτὸ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες, οὕτως αὐτὸν ἀνυμνοῦμεν, θαυμάζοντες, ἐκπληττόμενοι τῆς ἀφάτου δωρεᾶς. κ.τ.λ.*

Note, though Chrysostom here makes mention of hymns only, in accounting for the name of eulogy, or blessing, yet he did not mean that hymns only were used at that time in consecrating, for he elsewhere plainly speaks of prayer besides, prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost. *Ὅταν δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κάλῃ, καὶ τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ἐπιτελῇ θυσίαν, καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων συνεχῶς ἐφάπτηται δεσπότου, ποῦ τάξομεν αὐτὸν, εἰπέ μοι;* De Sacerdot. lib. vi. c. 4. p. 424. ed. Bened. Compare Theophyl. on John vi., who speaks as fully to the same purpose.

is consonant, that a sacerdotal blessing was previous to the delivering the sacred symbols [h], made sacred by that benediction. And this is confirmed from hence, (as before hinted,) that an unworthy communicant is guilty of profane irreverence; viz. towards what is supposed holy, before he receives it. As to St. Paul's expression, we bless, it means no more than if he had said, we Christians bless, meaning, by the proper officers. To strain a common idiom of speech to the utmost rigour is not right: it might as well be pleaded, that St. Paul must be present in person at every consecration; for ordinarily, when a man says we, he includes himself in the number. It must be owned, that it depends upon the disposition of every communicant, to render the previous consecration either salutary or noxious to himself: and if any man has a mind to call a worthy reception of the elements, a consecration of them to himself, a secondary consecration, he may [i]; for it would not be worth while to hold a dispute about words. But strictly speaking, it is not within the power or choice of a communicant, either to consecrate or to desecrate the symbols, to make the sacrament a common meal, or otherwise: it is a religious and sacred meal even to the most unworthy; and that is the reason why such are liable to the judgment of God for abusing it: for if it were really a common meal to them, it would do them no more hurt, than any other ordinary entertainment. Holy things are fit for holy persons, and will turn to their nutriment and increase: but to the unholy and profane, if they presume to come near, the sanctified instruments do as certainly turn to their detriment and condemnation. There are proofs of this, in great abundance, quite through the Old Testament, and I need not point out to the reader what he may everywhere find.

[h] Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος. Justin Mart. p. 96. See Archbishop Potter on Church Government, p. 262, &c.

[i] 'Igitur non sacrificia sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget sacrificio Deus: sed conscientia ejus qui offert, sanctificat sacrificium, pura existens,' &c. Iren. lib. iv. c. 18, p. 250.

N.B. Here, sanctifying means rendering salutary: not that that alone does it, but it is a condition sine qua non.

One thing more I may note here in passing, for the preventing cavils or mistakes. When we speak of human benedictions, and their efficacy, we mean not that they have any real virtue or efficacy in themselves, or under any consideration but as founded in Divine promise or contract, and as coming from God by man. If the prayer of faith saved the sick [k], it was not properly the human prayer that did it, but God did it by or upon such prayer, pursuant to his promise. In like manner, whatever consecration, or benediction, or sanctification is imparted in the Sacrament to things or persons, it is all God's doing; and the ground of all stands in the Divine warrant authorizing men to administer the holy Communion, in the Divine word intimating the effect of it, and in the Divine promise and covenant, tacit or express [l], to send his blessing along with it.

3. The third and most material article of inquiry is, what the consecration of the elements really amounts to, or what the effect of it is? To which we answer, thus much at least is certain, that the bread and wine being 'sanctified by the word of God and prayer [m],' (according to the Apostle's general rule, applicable in an eminent manner to this particular case,) do thereby contract a relative holiness, or sanctification, in some degree or other. What the degree is, is nowhere precisely determined; but the measures of it may be competently taken from the ends and uses of the service, from the near relation it bears to our Lord's Person, (a Person of infinite dignity,) and from the judgments denounced against irreverent offenders, and perhaps from some other considerations to be mentioned as we go along.

For the clearer conception of this matter, we may take a brief survey of what relative holiness meant under the Old Testament,

[k] James v. 15.

[l] I say, tacit or express: because our Lord's declaring, and St. Paul's declaring what is done in the Eucharist, do amount to a tacit promise of what shall be done always. Wherefore the Socinians do but trifle with us, when they call for an express promise. Are not the words, 'this is my body,' &c., and 'is it not the communion,' &c., tantamount to a Divine promise of everything we contend for? But this is not the place to explain that whole matter: thus much is evident, that what the word of prayer did once make the sacramental bread and wine to be, that it will always make it.

[m] 1 Tim. iv. 5.

and of the various degrees of it. I shall say nothing of the relative holiness of persons, but of what belonged to inanimate things, which is most to our present purpose. The court of the temple was holy [n], the temple itself more holy, and the sanctuary, or holy of holies, was still more so [o]: but the ark of God, laid up in the sanctuary, appears to have been yet holier than all. The holiness of the ark was so great, and so tremendous, that many were struck dead at once, only for presuming to look into it with eyes impure [p]: and Uzzah but for touching it (though with a pious intent to preserve it from falling) was instantly smitten of God, and died upon the spot [q]. Whatever God is once pleased to sanctify by his more peculiar presence, or to claim a more special property in, or to separate to sacred uses, that is relatively holy, as having a nearer relation to God; and it must of course be treated with a reverence and awe suitable. Be the thing what it will, be it otherwise ever so mean and contemptible in itself, yet as soon as God gives it a sacred relation, and, as it were, seals it with his own signet, it must then be looked upon with an eye of reverence, and treated with an awful respect, for fear of trespassing against the Divine majesty, in making that common which God has sanctified.

This notion of relative holiness is a very easy and intelligible notion: or if it wanted any further illustration, might be illustrated from familiar examples in a lower kind, of relative sacredness accruing to inanimate things by the relation they bear to earthly majesty. The thrones, or sceptres, or crowns, or presence-rooms of princes are, in this lower sense, relatively sacred: and an offence may be committed against the majesty of the sovereign, by an irreverence offered to what so peculiarly belong to him. If any one should ask, what is conveyed to the respective things to make them holy or sacred? we might ask, in our turn, what was conveyed to the ground which Moses once stood upon, to make it holy ground [r]? or what was conveyed to

[n] 1 Kings viii. 64.

[o] The Rabbins reckon up ten degrees of such relative holiness. Vid. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 546.

[p] 1 Sam. vi. 19.

[q] 2 Sam. vi. 7. 1 Chron. xiii. 9, 10.

[r] Exod. iii. 5.

the gold which the temple was said to sanctify [s], or what to the gift when the altar sanctified it [t]? But to answer more directly, as to things common becoming holy or sacred, I say, a holy or sacred relation is conveyed to them by their appropriation or use; and that suffices. The things are in themselves just what they before were [u]: but now they are considered by reasonable creatures as coming under new and sacred relations, which have their moral effect; insomuch that now the honour of the Divine majesty in one case, or of royal in the other case, becomes deeply interested in them.

Let us next apply these general principles to the particular instance of relative holiness supposed to be conveyed to the symbols of bread and wine by their consecration. They are now no more common bread and wine, (at least not during this their sacred application,) but the communicants are to consider the relation which they bear, and the uses which they serve to. I do not here say what, because I have no mind to anticipate what more properly belongs to another head, or to a distinct chapter hereafter: but in the general I observe, that they contract a relative holiness [v] by their consecration, and that is the effect. Hence it is, that some kinds of irreverence towards these sacred symbols amount to being 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord [x],' the Lord of glory; and hence also it was that many of the Corinthians, in the apostolical age, were punished as severely for offering contempt to this holy solemnity, as others formerly were for their irreverence towards the ark of God: that is to say, they were smitten of God with diseases and death [y].

[s] Matt. xxiii. 17.

[t] Matt. xxiii. 19.

[u] 'When certain things are said to be holy or sacred, no moral quality of holiness inheres in the things, only an obligation is laid upon men, to treat them in such a particular manner: and when that obligation ceases, they are supposed to fall again into promiscuous and ordinary use.' Puffendorf, Law of Nature, ch. i. concerning moral entities.

[v] The ancients therefore frequently gave the title of holy, holy of the Lord, or even holy of holies, and the like, to the sacred elements. Testimonies are collected by Suicer, tom. i. pp. 56, 62. Albertin. pp. 345, 346, 376. Grabe, Spicil. tom. i. p. 343.

[x] 1 Cor. xi. 27. [y] 1 Cor. xi. 30.

Enough hath been said for the explaining the general nature or notion of relative holiness: or if the reader desires more, he may consult Mr. Mede, who professedly considers the subject more at large [z]. Such a relative holiness does undoubtedly belong to the elements once consecrated. The ancient Fathers are still more particular in expounding the sacerdotal consecration, and the Divine sanctification consequent thereupon. Their several sentiments have been carefully collected, and useful remarks added, by the learned Pfaffius [a]. It may be proper here to give some brief account of their way of explaining this matter, and to consider what judgment it may be reasonable to make of it. Mr. Aubertine has judiciously reduced their sentiments of consecration to three heads, as follows [b]: 1. The power of Christ and the Holy Spirit, as the principal, or properly efficient cause. 2. Prayers, thanksgivings, benedictions, as the conditional cause, or instrumental. 3. The words of our Lord, 'This is my body, this is my blood,' as declarative of what then was, promissory of what should be always. I shall throw in a few remarks upon the several heads in their order.

1. As to the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit, (in conjunction with God the Father,) I suppose, the ancients might infer their joint operations in the Sacraments, partly from the general doctrine of Scripture relating to their joint concurrence in promoting man's salvation [c], and partly from their being jointly honoured or worshipped in sacramental services [d]; and partly also from what is particularly taught in Scripture with respect

[z] Mede's Works, pp. 399, &c. and 823. Dissertationum Triga. Lond. A.D. 1653.

[a] Pfaffius, Dissert. de Consecratione veterum Eucharistica, p. 355. Compare l'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part i. ch. 8. p. 65, &c.

[b] Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. 7. p. 34.

[c] Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. John xiv. 16, 26. Rom. v. 5, 6. 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6. 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; xiii. 14. Ephes. i. 17, 21, 22. 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6. 1 Pet. i. 2.

[d] Baptism in the name of all three. Matt. xxviii. 19. As to the Eucharist, Justin Martyr is an early witness, that the custom was to make mention of all the three Persons in that service.

Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος, καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει. Apol. i. p. 96.

to our Lord's concern in the Eucharist, or the Holy Spirit's. It is observable that the doctrine of the Fathers, with regard to consecration, was much the same in relation to the waters of Baptism, as in relation to the elements in the Eucharist. They supposed a kind of descent of the Holy Ghost, to sanctify the waters in one, and the symbols in the other, to the uses intended: and they seem to have gone upon this general Scripture principle, (besides particular texts relating to each sacrament,) that the Holy Ghost is the immediate fountain of all sanctification. I believe they were right in the main thing, only not always accurate in expression. Had they said, that the Holy Ghost came upon the recipients, in the due use of the sacraments, they had spoken with greater exactness; and perhaps it was all that they really meant. They could not be aware of the disputes which might arise in after times, nor think themselves obliged to a philosophical strictness of expression. It was all one with them to say, in a confuse general way, either that the Holy Ghost sanctified the 'receivers in the use of the outward symbols,' or that he 'sanctified the symbols to their use:' for either expression seemed to amount to the same thing; though in strictness there is a considerable difference between them. What Mr. Hooker very judiciously says, of the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, appears to be equally applicable to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the same: 'It is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . As for the Sacraments, they really exhibit; but for ought we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow[e].' Not that I conceive there is any absurdity in supposing a peculiar presence of the Holy Ghost to inanimate things, any more than in God's appearing in a burning bush[f]: but there is no proof of the fact,

[e] Hooker, Eccl. Polity, b. v. pp. 307, 308. Archbishop Cranmer had said the same thing before, in his preface to his book against Gardiner: I shall have another occasion, lower down, for citing his words. Conf. Sam. Ward, Determinat. Theolog. p. 62.

[f] Exod. iii. 2. Acts vii. 30.

either from direct Scripture, or from that in conjunction with the reason of the thing. The relative holiness of the elements, or symbols, as explained above, is very intelligible, without this other supposition: and as to the rest, it is all more rationally accounted for (as we shall see hereafter) by the presence of the Holy Spirit with the worthy receivers, in the use of the symbols, than by I know not what presence or union with the symbols themselves [g].

2. The second article, mentioned by Albertinus, relates to prayers, thanksgivings, and benedictions, considered as instrumental in consecration. It has been a question, whether the earlier Fathers (those of the three first centuries) allowed of any proper prayer, as distinct from thanksgiving, in the Eucharistical consecration. I think they did, though the point is scarce worth disputing, since they plainly allowed of a sanctification of the elements, consequent upon what was done by the officiating minister. But we may examine a few authorities, and as briefly as possible.

Justin Martyr, more than once, calls the consecrated elements by the name of eucharistized food [h], which looks as if he thought that the thanksgiving was the consecration: but yet he commonly makes mention both of prayers and thanksgiving [i], where he speaks of the Eucharistical service; from whence it appears probable, or certain rather, that consecration, at that time, was performed by both.

Irenaeus [k] speaks of the bread as receiving the invocation of God, and thereby becoming more than common bread. Some would interpret it of prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost [l]; but, as I apprehend, without sufficient authority. Irenaeus might mean no more than calling upon God, in any kind of

[g] Vid. Vossius de Sacrament. Vi et Efficacia, A.D. 1648. tom. vi. p. 252. de Bapt. Diss. v. p. 174. Harmon. Evangel. 233. A.D. 1656.

[h] Εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου. . . . εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. Apol. i. p. 96.

[i] Λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας. Apol. i. p. 19. Τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν. Ibid. p. 96. Εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας. p. 98. Εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι. Dial. p. 387.

[k] Ὁ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία. Iren. lib. iv. c. 18. p. 251.

[l] Pfaffius in Praefat. ad Fragm. Anecdota et in Lib. p. 96.

prayer or thanksgiving, or in such as Justin Martyr before him had referred to. Irenaeus, in the same chapter, twice speaks of thanksgiving [m], as used before or at the consecration: but nothing can be certainly inferred from thence, as to his excluding prayer, and resolving the consecration into bare thanksgiving.

Origen has expressed this whole matter with as much judgment and exactness, as one shall anywhere meet with among the ancient Fathers. He had been considering our Lord's words, 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man [n];' upon which he immediately thought with himself, that by parity of reason, it might as justly be said, that what goes into the mouth cannot sanctify a man. And yet here he was aware, that according to the vulgar way of conceiving or speaking, the sacramental elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist were supposed to sanctify the receiver, having themselves been sanctified before in their consecration. This was true in some sense, and according to a popular way of speaking; and therefore could not be denied by Origen, without wary and proper distinctions. He allows, in the first place, that the elements were really sanctified; namely, by the word of God and prayer [o]: but he denies that what is so sanctified, sanctifies any person by its own proper virtue [p], or considered according to its matter, which goes in at the mouth, and is cast off in the draught; admitting, however, that the prayer and word (that is, God by them) do enlighten the mind and sanctify the heart (for that is his meaning) of the worthy receiver. So he resolves the virtue of the Sacrament into the sacerdotal consecration, previous to the worthy reception: and he reckons prayer (strictly so called) as part of the consecration. The sum is, that the sanctification, properly speaking,

[m] 'Offerens ei cum gratiarum actione..... Panem in quo gratiae actae sint.' Iren. p. 251.

[n] Matt. xv. 11.

[o] 'Ἁγιασθέντος λόγῳ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξει ἄρτου.... τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως. Orig. in Matt. p. 254.

[p] Οὐ τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ ἁγιάζει τὸν χρώμενον. p. 253. Κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν, εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὠφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἰτιον διαβλέψεως, ὁρῶντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφελοῦν. καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν. p. 254.

goes to the person fitly disposed, and is the gift of God, not the work of the outward elements, though sanctified in a certain sense, as having been consecrated to holy uses. Thus by carefully distinguishing upon the case, he removed the difficulty arising from a common and popular way of expressing it. Nevertheless, after this [q], in his latest and most correct work, he did not scruple to make use of the same popular kind of expression, observing that the eucharistical bread, by prayer and thanksgiving, was made a sort of holy, or sanctified body, sanctifying the worthy receivers [r]. Where we may note, that he again takes in both prayer and thanksgiving, to make the consecration. And we may observe another thing, by the way, worth the noting, that by body there, he does not understand our Lord's natural body, but the sanctified bread, which he elsewhere calls the symbolical and typical body [s]; that is to say, representative body, as distinguished from the real body, or true food of the soul, which none but the holy partake of, and all that do so are happy. Origen's doctrine therefore, with respect to this article, lies in these particulars: 1. That the bread and wine, before consecration, are common food. 2. That after consecration by prayer and thanksgiving, they become holy, typical, symbolical food, representative of true food. 3. That unworthy receivers eat of the symbolical food only, without the true. 4. That worthy receivers, upon eating the symbolical food, are enlightened and sanctified from above, and consequently do partake of the true spiritual food, in the same act. I shall proceed no lower with the Fathers, under this article, having said as much as I conceive sufficient for illustrating Mr. Aubertine's second particular.

3. The third will still want some explication: where we are

[q] The Homilies on St. Matthew are supposed to have been written in the year of our Lord 244, and his book against Celsus A.D. 249. Origen died in 253.

[r] Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγιόν τι, καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετ' ὑγιοῖς προθέσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους. Origen. contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 766. edit. Bened.

[s] Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος, πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν. Origen. in Matt. p. 254.

to consider what effect the words of our Lord, 'This is my body,' are conceived now to have in the Eucharistical consecration. It is not meant (as the Romanists are pleased to interpret) that the pronouncing these words makes the consecration: but the words then spoken by our blessed Lord are conceived to operate now as virtually carrying in them a rule, or a promise, for all succeeding ages of the Church, that what was then done when our Lord himself administered, or consecrated, will be always done in the celebration of the Eucharist, pursuant to that original. If the elements were then sanctified or consecrated into representative symbols of Christ's body and blood, and if the worthy receivers were then understood to partake of the true spiritual food upon receiving the symbolical; and if all this was then implied in the words, 'This is my body,' &c., so it is now. What the Sacrament then was, in meaning, virtue, and effect, the same it is also at this day. Such was the way of reasoning which some of the Fathers made use of; and it appears to have been perfectly right and just. It was with this view, or under this light, that they took upon them to say, that our Lord's words then spoken, were to have their effect in every consecration after; namely, as being directly declaratory of what then was, and virtually promissory of what should be in like case for all times to come. The same Lord is our High Priest in heaven, recommending and enforcing our prayers there, and still constantly ratifying what he once said, 'This is my body,' &c. For, like as the words once spoken, 'Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth,' have their effect at this day, and in all ages of the world; so the words of our Lord, 'This is my body,' though spoken but once by him, stand in full force and virtue, and will ever do so, in all ages of the Christian Church. This is the sum of St. Chrysostom's reasoning upon this head; which it may suffice barely to refer to[t]: Mr. Pfaffius has collected from him what was most material, illustrating all with proper remarks[u]. The use I would further

[t] Chrysost. Homil. i. de Proditione Judae, tom. ii. p. 384. ed. Bened.

[u] Pfaffius de Consecratione Vet. Eucharistica, p. 389, &c. Compare Bingham, b. xiv. ch. 3. sect. 11. Albertin. lib. i. c. 7. p. 33; and Covel's Account of the Greek Church, pp. 47, 48, 63, &c.

make of the notion is, to endeavour from hence to explain some short and obscure hints of the elder Fathers. For example, Justin Martyr speaks of the elements being eucharistized or blessed by the prayer of the word that came from him [x] [God]. Why might not he mean the very same thing that Chrysostom does, namely, that Christ, our High Priest above, now ratifies what he once said on earth, when he blessed the elements with his consecration prayers, in the institution of the Eucharist? It is he that now sanctifies the symbols, as he then did, and, as it were, presides over our Eucharistical services, making the bread to become holy, which before was common, and giving the true food to as many as are qualified to receive it, along with the symbolical; that is, giving himself to dwell in us, as we also in him. There is another the like obscure hint in Irenaeus, which may probably be best interpreted after the same way. He supposes the elements to become Christ's body by receiving the word [y]. He throws two considerations into one, and does not distinguish so accurately as Origen afterwards did, between the symbolical food and the true food. In strictness, the elements first become sanctified (in such a sense as inanimate things may) by consecration pursuant to our Lord's institution, and which our Lord still ratifies; and thus they are made the representative body of Christ: but they are at the same time, to worthy receivers, made the means of their spiritual union with Christ himself; which Irenaeus points at in what he says of the bread's receiving the Logos, but should rather have said it of the communicants themselves, as receiving the spiritual presence of Christ, in the worthy use of the sacred symbols. But this matter must come over again, and be distinctly considered at large. All I had to do here was, to fix the true notion of consecration in as clear and distinct a manner as I could. The sum is, that the consecration of the elements makes them holy symbols, relatively holy, on account of their relation to what they

[x] Τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. Justin Mart. p. 96. Cp. Albertin. p. 31.

[y] Ὁπότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, &c. Iren. lib. v. c. 2. p. 294. προσλαμβάνειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται. Ibid.

represent, or point to, by Divine institution: and it is God that gives them this holiness by the ministry of the word. The sanctification of the communicants (which is God's work also) is of distinct consideration from the former, though they are often confounded: and to this part belongs what has been improperly called making the symbols become our Lord's body; and which really means making them his body to us; or more plainly still, making us partakers of our Lord's broken body and blood shed at the same time that we receive the holy symbols; which we are to explain in the sequel. I shall only remark further here, what naturally follows from all going before, that the consecration, or sanctification of the elements in this service, is absolute and universal for the time being; and therefore all that communicate unworthily are chargeable with profaning things holy: but the sanctification of persons is hypothetical and particular, depending upon the dispositions which the communicants bring with them to the Lord's table.

Having done with the consecration of the elements, I should now proceed to the distribution and manducation. But as there is a sacramental feeding and a spiritual feeding; and as the spiritual is the nobler of the two, and of chief concern, and what the other principally or solely looks to, I conceive it will be proper to treat of this first: and because the sixth chapter of St. John contains the doctrine of spiritual feeding, as delivered by our Lord himself, a twelvemonth, or more, before he instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist, I shall make that the subject of the next chapter.

CHAP. VI.

Of Spiritual Eating and Drinking, as taught in John vi.

THE discourse which our Lord had at Capernaum, about the eating his flesh and drinking his blood, is very remarkable, and deserves our closest attention. His strong way of expressing himself, and his emphatical repeating the same thing, in the same or in different phrases, are alone sufficient to persuade us, that some very important mystery, some very

significant lesson of instruction is contained in what he said in that chapter, from verse the 27th to verse the 63rd inclusive.

For the right understanding of that discourse, we must take our marks from some of the critical parts of it, and from other explanatory places of Scripture. From verse the 63rd, as well as from the nature of the thing, we may learn, that the discourse is mostly mystical, and ought to be spiritually, not literally understood[z]. 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' I am aware that this text has been variously interpreted[a], and that it is not very easy to ascertain the construction, so as not to leave room even for reasonable doubt. I choose that interpretation which appears most natural, and which has good countenance from antiquity, and many judicious interpreters[b]; but the reason of the thing is sufficient to satisfy us, that a great part of this discourse of our Lord's cannot be literally interpreted, but must admit of some figurative or mystical construction.

A surer mark for interpreting our Lord's meaning in this chapter is the universality of the expressions which he made use of, both in the affirmative and negative way. 'If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever[c].' 'Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life[d],'—'dwelleth in me, and I in him[e].' So far in the affirmative or positive way: the propositions are universal affirmatives, as the schools speak. The like may be observed in the negative way: 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you[f].' The sum is: all that feed upon what is here mentioned have life; and all that do not feed thereupon have no life. Hence arises an argument against interpreting the words of sacramental feeding in the Eucharist. For it is not true that

[z] Orig. in Levit. Hom. vii. p. 225. Eusebius de Eccl. Theol. l. iii. c. 12. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xvi. p. 251. Mystag. iv. 321. Chrysostom. in loc. Athanasius ad Serap. Ep. iv. p. 710. ed. Bened. Augustinus in Psalm. xcviii.

[a] Vid. Albertin. de Eucharist. p. 243, &c.

[b] Vid. Albertin. p. 244.

[c] John vi. 51. [d] John vi. 54.

[e] John vi. 56. [f] John vi. 53.

all who receive the Communion have life, unless we put in the restriction of 'worthy,' and 'so far.' Much less can it be true, that all who never have, or never shall receive, have not life; unless we make several more restrictions, confining the proposition to persons living since the time of the institution, and persons capable, and not destitute of opportunity: making exceptions for good men of old, and for infants, and for many who have been or may be invincibly ignorant, or might never have it in their power to receive the Communion, or to know anything of it. Now an interpretation which must be clogged with a multitude of restrictions to make it bear, if at all, is such as one would not choose (other circumstances being equal) in preference to what is clogged with fewer, or with none[g].

Should we interpret the words, of faith in Christ, there must be restrictions in that case also; viz. to those who have heard of Christ, and who do not only believe in him, but live according to his laws. And exceptions must be made for many good men of old, who either knew nothing of Christ, or very obscurely; as likewise for infants and idiots; and perhaps also for many who are in utter darkness without any fault of theirs: so that this construction comes not fully up to the universality of the expressions made use of by our Lord.

But if neither of these can answer in that respect, is there any other construction that will? or what is it? Yes, there is one which will completely answer in point of universality, and it is this: all that shall finally share in the death, passion and atonement of Christ, are safe; and all that have not a part therein are lost[h]. All that are saved owe their salvation to the salutary passion of Christ: and their partaking thereof (which is feeding upon his flesh and blood) is their life. On the other hand, as many as are excluded from sharing therein,

[g] Cp. Albertin. de Eucharist. pp. 234, 235.

[h] 'Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus, vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, praecipiens passioni Dominicae communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.' Augustin. de Doctrin. Christian. lib. iii. cap. 16. p. 52. tom. iii. Bened.

and therefore feed not upon the atonement, have no life in them. Those who are blessed with capacity and opportunities, must have faith, must have sacraments, must be in covenant, must receive and obey the Gospel, in order to have the expiation of the death of Christ applied to them: but our Lord's general doctrine in this chapter seems to abstract from all particularities, and to resolve into this; that whether with faith or without, whether in the sacraments or out of the sacraments, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be accepted, but in and through the grand propitiation made by the blood of Christ. This I take to be the main doctrine taught by our Lord in that chapter, which he delivers so earnestly, and inculcates so strongly, for the glory of the Divine justice, holiness, goodness, philanthropy; and for humbling the pride of sinners, apt to conceive highly of their own worth; as also for the convincing all men, to whom the Gospel should be propounded, of the absolute necessity of closing in with it, and living up to it. That general doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, by Christ crucified, is the great and important doctrine, the burden of both Testaments; signified in all the sacrifices and services of the old law, and fully declared in every page almost of the New Testament. What doctrine more likely to have been intended in John vi., if the words will bear it; or if, over and above, the universality of the expressions appears to require it? Eating and drinking, by a very easy, common figure, mean receiving[i]: and what is the thing to be received? Christ himself in his whole person: 'I am the bread of life[k].'—'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me[l].' But more particularly he is to be considered as giving his body to be broken, and as shedding his blood for making an atonement: and so the fruits of his death are what we are to receive as our spiritual food: his 'flesh is meat indeed,' and

[i] So eating and drinking damnation (1 Cor. xi. 29) is receiving damnation.

[k] John vi. 35, 48, 51. [l] John vi. 57.

his 'blood is drink indeed [m].' His passion is our redemption, and by his death we live. This meat is administered to us by the hand of God; while by the hand of faith, ordinarily, we take it, and in the use of the sacraments [n]. But God may extraordinarily administer the same meat, that is, may apply the same benefits of Christ's death, and virtue of his atonement, to subjects capable, without any act of theirs; as to infants, idiots, &c., who are merely passive in receiving it, but at the same time offer no obstacle to it.

The xxviiith Article of our Church says, 'that the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.' That sacrament is supposed to be given to none but adults; and to them, not only faith in general, but a true and right faith, and the same working by love, is indispensably requisite, as an ordinary mean [o]. All which is consonant to what I have here asserted, and makes no alteration as to the exposition of John vi., which speaks not principally of what is required in adult Christians, or of what is requisite to a worthy reception of the holy Communion, but of what is absolutely necessary at all times, and to all persons, and in all circumstances, to a happy resurrection; namely, an interest in, or a participation of, the atonement made by Christ upon the cross. He that is taken in, as a sharer in it, is saved: he that is excluded from it, is lost.

Some learned writers having observed that our Lord in that chapter attributes much to a man's believing in him, or coming to him, as the means to everlasting life, have conceived that faith, or doctrine, is what he precisely meant by the bread of life, and that believing in Christ is the same with the eating and drinking there spoken of. But the thing to be received is very distinct from the hand receiving; therefore faith is not the

[m] John vi. 55.

[n] 'Sacramenta sunt media offerentia et exhibentia ex parte Dei: fides medium recipiens et apprehendens ex parte nostra: quemadmodum igitur manus donans, et manus recipiens non sunt opposita sed relata, et subordinata, ita quoque Sacramenta et fides non sunt sibi invicem opponenda.' Gerhard. Loc. Comm. par. iv. p. 309.

[o] Ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑφ' ἡμῶν. . . . καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. Justin Mart. Apol. i. p. 96.

meat, but the mean. Belief in Christ is the condition required, the duty commanded: but the bread of life is the reward consequent. Believing is not eating or drinking the fruits of Christ's passion, but is preparatory to it, as the means to the end [p]. In short, faith, ordinarily, is the qualification, or one qualification; but the body and blood is the gift itself, and the real inheritance. The doctrine of Christ, lodged in the soul, is what gives the soul its proper temperature and fitness to receive the heavenly food: but the heavenly food is Christ himself, as once crucified, who has since been glorified. See this argument very clearly and excellently made out at large by a late learned writer [q]. It may be true, that eating and drinking wisdom is the same with receiving wisdom: and it is no less true, that eating and drinking flesh and blood is receiving flesh and blood; for eating means receiving. But where does flesh or blood stand for wisdom or for doctrine? What rules of symbolical language are there that require it, or can ever admit of it? There lies the stress of the whole thing. Flesh, in symbolical language, may signify riches, goods, possessions [r]: and blood may signify life: but Scripture never uses either as a symbol of doctrine. To conclude then, eating wisdom is receiving wisdom; but eating Christ's flesh and blood is receiving life and happiness through his blood, and, in one word, receiving him; and that not merely as the object of our faith, but as the fountain of our salvation, and our sovereign good, by means of his death and passion.

To confirm what has been said, let us take in a noted text of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which appears decisive in this case. 'We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which

[p] 'Credere in Christum, et edere Christum, vel carnem ejus, inter se tanquam prius et posterius differunt; sicuti ad Christum venire et Christum bibere. Praecedit enim accessus et apprehensio, quam sequitur potio, et manducatio: ergo fide Christum prius recipimus, ut habitet ipse in nobis, fiamusque ipsius vivae carnis et sanguinis participes, adeoque unum cum ipso. . . . Itaque, notione definitioneque aliud est spiritualis manducatio quam credere in Christum.' Lamb. Danaeus Apolog. pro Helvet. Eccles. p. 23.

[q] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 393, &c.

[r] See Lancaster's Symbolical Dictionary, prefixed to his Abridgment of Daubuz, p. 45.

serve the tabernacle[s].' Whether the Apostle here speaks of spiritual eating in the sacrament, or out of the sacrament, is not now the question: but that he speaks of spiritual eating cannot reasonably be doubted. And what can the eating there mean, but the partaking of Christ crucified, participating of the benefits of his passion? That is the proper Christian eating, such as none but Christians have a clear and covenanted right to. The Apostle speaks not in that chapter of eating doctrine, but of eating sacrifice. The references there made to the Jewish sacrifices plainly shew, that the Apostle there thought not of eating the doctrine of the cross, but of eating, that is, partaking of, the sacrifice or atonement of the cross[t]. Therefore let this be taken in, as an additional explication of the eating mentioned in John vi., so far at least as to shew that it must refer to some sacrifice, and not to mere doctrines.

I am aware that many interpreters of good note among the ancients[u], as well as many learned moderns, have understood altar in that text directly of the Lord's table, and the eating, of oral manducation: which construction would make the text less suitable to my present purpose. But other interpreters[v], of good note also, have understood the altar there mentioned of the altar in heaven, or of the altar of the cross (both which resolve at length into one); and some have defended that construction with great appearance of reason. Estius, in particular, after Aquinas and others, has very ingenuously and rationally maintained it, referring also to John vi. 51, as parallel or similar to it, and understanding both of spiritual eating, abstracted from

[s] Heb. xiii. 10: compare Rev. vi. 9. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 542.

[t] 'Mihi perspicuum videtur esse, aram hic poni pro victima in ara Deo oblata. Sensus verborum hic est, ut puto: Jesu Christi, qui vera est pro peccatis hominum victima, nemo fieri particeps potest, qui in ceremoniis et externis ritibus Judaicis, religionis arcem censet esse positam.' Moshem. ad Cudworth. p. 3.

[u] Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Primasius, Sedulius, Haymo, Remigius, Anselm. 'Plerique tam veteres quam recentiores significari volunt mensam Dominicam.' Estius in loc.

[v] Chrysostom. in Hebr. Hom. xi. p. 807. Cyrill. Alex. de Adorat. lib. ix. 310. Compare Lightfoot, Opp. tom. ii. part. 2. pp. 1259-1264. Outram de Sacrif. p. 332, &c. Wolfius, Cur. Crit. in loc.

sacramental[x]. In this construction I acquiesce, as most natural and most agreeable to the whole context: neither am I sensible of any just objection that can be made to it. The Apostle did not mean, that they who served the tabernacle had no right to believe in Christ; that indeed would be harsh: but he meant that they who served the tabernacle, not believing in Christ, or however still adhering too tenaciously to the legal oblations, had no right or title to partake of the sacrifice or atonement made by Christ. The thought is somewhat similar to what the same Apostle has elsewhere signified; namely, that they who affected to be justified by the law, forfeited all benefit arising from the grace of the Gospel, and Christ could profit them nothing[y].

But for the clearer perception of spiritual feeding, and for the preventing confusion of ideas, it will be proper to distinguish between what it is primarily, and what secondarily; or between the thing itself, and the effects, fruits, or consequences of it. 1. Spiritual feeding, in this case, directly and primarily means no more than the eating and drinking our Lord's body broken, and blood shed; that is, partaking of the atonement made by his death and sufferings: this is the prime thing, the ground and basis of all the rest. We must first be reconciled to God by the death of his Son, before we can have a just claim or title to any thing besides[z]: therefore the foundation of all our spiritual privileges is our having a part in that reconcilement; which, in strictness, is eating and drinking his flesh and blood in St. John's phrase, and eating of the altar in St. Paul's. 2. The result, fruit, or effect of our thus eating his crucified body is a right to be fellow-heirs with his body glorified: for if we are made partakers of his death, we shall be also of his resurrection[a]. On this is founded our mystical union with Christ's glorified body,

[x] 'Huc etiam pertinet, quod corpus Christi, in cruce oblatum, panis vocatur, fide manducandus. Ut Joann. vi. Panis, inquit, quem ego dabo, caro mea est, quam ego dabo pro mundi vita: scilicet, in cruce.' Estius in loc. Compare Bp. Moreton on the Sacrament, b. vi. chap. 3. p. 416.

[y] Gal. v. 2, 3, 4.

[z] Coloss. i. 20, 21, 22. Ephes. ii. 13, 16.

[a] Rom. v. 9, 10, 11. Phil. iii. 10, 11. Rom. vi. 5–8.

which neither supposes nor infers any local presence: for all the members of Christ, however distant in place, are thus mystically united with Christ, and with each other. And it is well known, that right or property, in any possession, is altogether independent of local presence, and may as easily be conceived without it as with it[b]. 3. Upon such mystical union with the body of Christ glorified, and making still part of his whole Person, follows a gracious vital presence of his Divine nature abiding in us, and dwelling with us[c]. Upon the same follows the like gracious vital presence, and indwelling of the other two Divine Persons[d]: and hereupon follow all the spiritual graces, wherewith the true members of Christ are enriched.

This orderly ranging of ideas may contribute very much towards the clearing our present subject of the many perplexities with which it has been embarrassed; and may further serve to shew us, where the ancients or moderns have happened to exceed, either in sentiment or expression, and how far they have done so, and how they were led into it. The ancients, in their account of spiritual feeling, have often passed over the direct and immediate feeding upon Christ considered as crucified, and have gone on to what is properly the result or consequence of it, namely, to the mystical union with the body glorified, and what hangs thereupon. There was no fault in so doing, more than what lies in too quick a transition or too confused a blending of ideas.

I am aware that much dispute has been raised by contending

[b] 'Pro tanta conjunctione asserenda inter nos et Christum non opus praesentia corporali aut substantiali corporis Christi, quam statuere multi conantur in Eucharistia. Nam ea nil plus vel commodi vel utilitatis habebimus quam si Christum quoad corpus suo loco sinamus in caelis. Videmus enim Christianos posse esse invicem membra, et quidem conjunctissima, tametsi aliquis eorum degat in Britannia, alius in Gallia, et alius in Hispania. Quod si de membris ipsis conceditur, cur de capite idem fateri erit absurdum, ut hac spirituali conjunctione simul possit in caelis esse, ac spiritualiter nobiscum conjungi? Quod idem in matrimonio usu venire intelligimus, ubi sancta Scriptura praedicat, virum et uxorem unam carnem esse: quod non minus verum fateri coguntur adversarii cum una conjuges habitant, quam si locorum intervallo nonnunquam disjungantur.' Pet. Martyr in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, fol. 178. Cp. Albertin. de Eucharist. pp. 230, 231.

[c] John vi. 56; xv. 4. Matt. xviii. 20; xxviii. 20.

[d] John xiv. 16, 17, 23. 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

parties about the sense of the ancients with respect to John vi. It may be a tedious inquiry to go through: for there is no doing it to the satisfaction of considering men, without taking every Father, one by one, and re-examining his sentiments, as they lie scattered in several places of his writings, and that with some care and accuracy. It may be of some use to go over that matter again, after many others, if the reader can but bear with a little prolixity, which will be here unavoidable. There have been two extremes in the accounts given of the Fathers, and both of them owing, as I conceive, to a neglect of proper distinctions. They who judge that the Fathers in general, or almost universally, do interpret John vi. of the Eucharist, appear not to distinguish between interpreting and applying: it was right to apply the general doctrine of John vi. to the particular case of the Eucharist, considered as worthily received; because the spiritual feeding there mentioned is the thing signified in the Eucharist, yea and performed likewise. After we have sufficiently proved, from other Scriptures, that in and by the Eucharist, ordinarily, such spiritual food is conveyed, it is then right to apply all that our Lord, by St John, says in the general, to that particular case: and this indeed the Fathers commonly did. But such application does not amount to interpreting that chapter of the Eucharist. For example; the words, 'except ye eat the flesh of Christ, &c., you have no life in you,' do not mean directly, that you have no life without the Eucharist, but that you have no life without participating of our Lord's passion: nevertheless, since the Eucharist is one way of participating of the passion, and a very considerable one, it was very pertinent and proper to urge the doctrine of that chapter, both for the clearer understanding the beneficial nature of the Eucharist, and for the exciting Christians to a frequent and devout reception of it. Such was the use which some early Fathers made of John vi. (as our Church also does at this day, and that very justly,) though I will not say that some of the later Fathers did not extend it further: as we shall see in due place.

As to those who, in another extreme, charge the Fathers in general as interpreting John vi. of digesting doctrines only,

they are more widely mistaken than the former, for want of considering the tropological way of commenting then in use: which was not properly interpreting, nor so intended[e], but was the more frequently made use of in this subject, when there was a mixed audience; because it was a rule not to divulge their mysteries before incompetent hearers, before the uninitiated, that is, the unbaptized. But let us now take the Fathers in their order, and consider their real sentiments, so far as we can see into them, with respect to John vi.

Ignatius never formally cites John vi., but he has been thought to favour the sacramental interpretation, because he believed the Eucharist to be a pledge or means of an happy resurrection: for it is suggested that he could learn that doctrine only from John vi.[f] But this appears to be pushing a point too far, and reasoning inconsequently. Ignatius might very easily have maintained his point, from the very words of the institution, to as many as knew anything of symbolical language: for what can any one infer less from the being symbolically fed with Christ's body crucified, but that it gives a title to an inheritance with the body glorified? Or, if the same Ignatius interpreted 1 Cor. x. 16 (as he seems to have done) of a mystical union with the body of Christ[g], then he had Scripture ground sufficient, without John vi., for making the Eucharist a pledge or means of an happy resurrection. John vi. may be of excellent use to us for explaining the beneficial nature of the Eucharist, spiritual manducation being presupposed as the thing signified in that Sacrament: but it will not be prudent to lessen the real force of other considerable texts, only for the sake of resting all upon John vi., which at length cannot be proved to belong directly or primarily to the Eucharist.

It seems that Ignatius had John vi. in his eye, or some

[e] See my Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity asserted, vol iii. pp. 649, 692, &c. and Preface to Scripture Vindicated, vol. iv. p. 160.

[f] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 387, 388.

[g] Ἓν ποτήριον, εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. Ignat. ad Philad. sect. iv. p. 27. Compare Chrysostom on 1 Cor. x. 16, who interprets communion there mentioned by ἕνωσις. αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου ἑνώμεθα.

phrases of it, in a very noted passage, where he had no thought of the Eucharist, but of eating the bread of life, after a more excellent way, in a state of glory. The passage is this: 'I am alive at this writing, but my desire is to die. My love is crucified, and I have no secular fire left: but there is in me living water, speaking to me within, and saying, Come to the Father. I delight not in corruptible food, nor in the entertainments of this world. The bread of God is what I covet; heavenly bread, bread of life, namely, the flesh of Christ Jesus the Son of God, who in these last times became the Son of David and of Abraham: and I am athirst for the drink of God, namely, his blood, which is a feast of love that faileth not, and life everlasting. I have no desire to live any longer among men; neither shall I, if you will but consent[h].'

Here we may take notice of heavenly bread, bread of God, bread of life, our Lord's own phrases in John vi. And Ignatius understands them of spiritual food, of feeding upon the flesh of Christ, the Son of God incarnate. Drink of God, he interprets in like manner, of the blood of Christ; which is the noblest feast, and life eternal. Learned men have disputed whether he intended what he said of sacramental food, or of celestial; whether of enjoying Christ in the Eucharist, or in heaven. To me it appears a clear point, that he thought not of communicating, but of dying: and the Eucharist was not the thing which he so earnestly begged to have, (for who would refuse it?) but martyrdom, which the Christians might endeavour to protract, out of an over-officious care for a life so precious. However, if the reader is desirous of seeing what has been pleaded on the side of the Eucharist, he may consult the authors referred to at the bottom[i],

[h] Ζῶν γὰρ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν· ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόϋλον· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. Οὐχ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς, οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου· ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς, ὅς ἐστιν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ υἱοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ γενομένου ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ· καὶ πόμα Θεοῦ θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος, καὶ ἀέννaος ζωή. Οὐκ ἔτι θέλω κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῆν· τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς θελήσητε. Ignat. ad Rom. cap. 7, 8.

[i] Smith. Not. in Ignat. pp. 101, 102. Grabe, Spicileg. tom. ii. p. 229. Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 387, alias 392.

and may compare what others have pleaded on the contrary side[k]. I see no impropriety in Ignatius's feeding on the flesh and blood of Christ in a state of glory[l], since the figure is easily understood, and is made use of by others[m] besides Ignatius. Our enjoyment in a world to come is entirely founded in the merits of Christ's passion: and our Lord's intercession for us (as I have above hinted) stands on the same bottom. Our spiritual food, both above and below, is the enjoyment of the same Christ, the Lamb slain. The future feast upon the fruits of his atonement is but the continuation and completion of the present. Only here it is under symbols, there it will be without them: here it is remote and imperfect, there it will be proximate and perfect.

It has been strongly averred, that Irenaeus understood John vi. of the Eucharist; though he never directly quotes it, nor ever plainly refers to it: but it is argued, that by the Eucharistical symbols (according to Irenaeus) we have the principle of a blessed immortality conveyed to our bodies, for which there is no appearance of proof in Scripture, but in John vi.: therefore here is as clear proof of his so interpreting that chapter, as if he had cited it at length[n]. How inconclusive this kind of reasoning is, and how injurious besides to our main cause, is visible enough, and has been intimated before, in answer to the like pretence concerning Ignatius. It appears the worse with respect to Irenaeus, because he manifestly did found his doctrine on 1 Cor. x. 16, and expressly quoted it for that very purpose[o]. He judged, as every sensible man must, that if the Eucharist, according to St. Paul,

[k] Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. num. 39. Albertinus, de Eucharist. lib. ii. c. 1. p. 286. Halloixius, Vit. Ignat. p. 410. Ittigius, Hist. Eccles. saec. ii. pp. 169, 170.

[l] A learned writer objects that the 'eating of Christ's flesh in another world, is a way of expression somewhat unaccountable.' Johnson's Unbloody Sacr. i. p. 389, alias 394.

[m] Athanasius de Incarn. et contr. Arrian. p. 883. Damascen. tom. i. p. 172. Augustin. tom. v. p. 384.

[n] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 387, alias 392.

[o] 'Vani autem omnimodo, qui... carnis salutem negant, et regenerationem ejus spernunt, dicentes, non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis. Si autem non salvetur haec, nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus est.' Iren. lib. v. cap. 2. p. 293. ed. Bened.

amounts to a communion, or communication of our Lord's body and blood to every faithful receiver, that then such receiver, for the time being, is therein considered as symbolically fed with the crucified body, and of consequence entitled to be fellow-heir with the body glorified[p]. He draws the same conclusion[q], though more obscurely, from the words of the institution, 'This is my body,' &c. And the conclusion is certain, and irresistible, when the words are rightly understood. Therefore let it not be thought that we have no appearance of proof, where we have strong proof; neither let us endeavour to loosen an important doctrine from its firm pillars, whereon it may stand secure, only to rest it upon weak supports, which can bear no weight.

Had Irenaeus been aware that John vi. was to be interpreted directly of the Eucharist, strange that he should not quote that rather than the other, or, however, along with the other, when he had so fair an occasion for it. Stranger still, that when he so frequently and so fully speaks his mind concerning the Eucharist, and with the greatest reverence imaginable, that he should never think of John vi. all the time; that he should never make any use at all of it for advancing the honour of the Sacrament, had he supposed that it strictly belonged to it, and was to be interpreted of it. The silence of a man so knowing in the Scriptures, and so devoutly disposed towards this holy Sacrament, is a strong presumptive argument (were there nothing else) of his understanding John vi. very differently from what some have imagined.

There is one place in Irenaeus which seems to carry some remote and obscure allusion to John vi. The Logos, the Divine nature of our Lord, according to him, is the perfect bread of the Father, and bread of immortality; and he talks of eating and drinking the same Logos, or Word[r]. If he had John vi. then in his eye, (which is not improbable,) he interpreted it, we see,

[p] See the argument explained in a Charge, upon the Doctrinal Use of the Sacrament, vol. v. p. 110, &c.

[q] Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251; lib. v. cap. 2. p. 294.

[r] Ὁ ἄρτος ὁ τέλειος τοῦ πατρὸς . . . . ὡς ὑπὸ μασθοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ τραφέντες . . . . ἐθισθέντες τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἄρτον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρός. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 38. p. 284.

not of sacramental manducation, but of spiritual; not of the signs, but of the things signified, apart from the signs. Only it is observable, that while he speaks of our feeding upon the Logos, he explains it as done through the medium of the flesh: it is the human nature, by which we are brought to feast upon the Divine. St. Chrysostom gives the like construction of bread of life in John vi., interpreting it, so far, of our Lord's Divine nature[s]. But I proceed.

Our next ancient writer is Clemens of Alexandria, who flourished about A. D. 192. In the first book of his Paedagogue, chapter vi., he quotes several verses[t] of our Lord's discourse in St. John, commenting upon them after a dark, allegorical way; so that it is not easy to learn how he understood the main doctrine of that chapter. I shall take notice of some of the clearest passages. After speaking of the Church under the figure or similitude of an infant, brought forth by Christ with bodily pain, and swaddled in his blood, he proceeds thus: 'The Word is all things to the infant, a father, a mother, a preceptor, a foster: Eat, says he, my flesh, and drink my blood. These are the proper aliments which our Lord administers: he reaches out flesh, and he pours out blood; and nothing is wanting for the growth of the infants. O wonderful mystery! he bids us lay aside the old carnal corruption, together with the antiquated food, and to partake of the new food of Christ, receiving him, if possible, so as to lay him up within ourselves and to inclose our Saviour in our breasts[u].' There is another passage, near akin to this, a few pages higher, which runs thus:

'Our Lord, in the Gospel according to St. John, has otherwise introduced it under symbols, saying, Eat my flesh, and drink my blood; allegorically signifying the clear liquor of faith, and of the promise, by both which the Church, like man,

[s] Καὶ *πρῶτον περὶ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ διαλέγεται, λέγων, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ τοῦ σώματος τοῦτο εἴρηται· περὶ γὰρ ἐκείνου πρὸς τῷ τέλει λέγει· καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν. Ἀλλὰ τέως περὶ τῆς θεότητος.* Καὶ *γὰρ ἐκείνη διὰ τὸν Θεὸν λόγον ἄρτος ἐστίν.* Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. xliv. p. 264. tom. viii. ed. Bened.

[t] John vi. 32, 33, 51, 53, 54, 55.

[u] Ὁ *λόγος τὰ πάντα τῷ νηπίῳ, κ. τ. λ.* Clem. Paedag. lib. i. cap. 6. p. 123. ed. Oxon.

compacted of many members, is watered and nourished, and is made up or compounded of both; of faith as the body, and of hope as the soul, like as our Lord of flesh and blood[x].' These hints appear to be very obscure ones, capable of being turned or wrested several ways. Some therefore have appealed to these and the like passages, to prove that Clemens understood John vi. of doctrines, or spiritual actions[y]. Others have endeavoured so to explain them, as to make them suit rather with the Eucharist[z]. Perhaps both may guess wide. In the first passage, Clemens says nothing of receiving either doctrines or Eucharist, but of receiving Christ himself: in the second, he does indeed speak of receiving faith and the promise; but then he owns it to be an allegorical or anagogical view of the text; from whence one may infer that he intended it not for the primary sense, or for strict interpretation. The doctrine which Clemens most clearly expresses, and uniformly abides by, is that Christ himself is our food and nutriment[a]: and, particularly, by shedding his blood for us[b].

At the end of Clemens, among the 'excerpta Theodoti,' there is a pretty remarkable passage; which, though it belongs to a Valentinian author, may be worth the taking notice of[c]. Commenting on John vi. he interprets the living bread, of the person of Christ: but as to our Lord's saying, ver. 49, 'The bread which I will give is my flesh,' he proposes a twofold construction. 1. He understands it of the bread in the Eucharist. 2. Correcting his first thought, he interprets bread to mean the Church;

[x] Ὁ *κύριος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίῳ. κ. τ. λ.* Clem. ibid. p. 121.

[y] Dr. Whitby, Dr. Claget, Basnage Annal. tom. i. p. 320.

[z] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 255, &c.

[a] Ὁ *κύριος, ἡ τροφὴ τῶν νηπίων.* Clem. ibid. p. 124. *ἡ τροφὴ, τουτέστι κύριος Ἰησοῦς.* Ibid. *ἡμῖν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἡ τροφὴ τοῖς νηπίοις.* p. 125. *ἄρτον αὐτὸν οὐρανῶν ὁμολογεῖ ὁ λόγος.* Ibid. *πολλαχῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ λόγος, καὶ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφὴ, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα.* p. 126.

[b] Τροφεὺς *ἡμῶν λόγος τὸ αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐξέχεεν αἷμα, σώζων τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.* Clem. ibid. p. 124. *Τὸ αὐτὸ ἄρα καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα τοῦ κυρίου πάθους καὶ διδασκαλίας σύμβολον.* p. 127.

[c] Ὁ *ζῶν ἄρτος, ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δοθεὶς, ὁ υἱός ἐστι, τοῖς ἐσθίειν βουλομένοις. ὁ δὲ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, φησὶν, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν. ἧτοι ᾧ τρέφεται ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ἢ ὅπερ καὶ μᾶλλον, ἡ σὰρξ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἄρτος οὐράνιος, συναγωγὴ εὐλογημένη.* Excerpt. Theod. apud Clem. p. 971.

having, as I conceive, 1 Cor. x. 17 in his eye, 'We being many are one bread, and one body.' Of what weight or authority a Valentinian gloss ought to be in this case, I pretend not to say: but this is the first clear precedent we shall meet with in antiquity, for interpreting any part of John vi. directly of the Eucharist. And it is observable, that it was offered only in the conjectural way, and another interpretation presently subjoined as preferable to it.

Tertullian quotes two verses out of John vi. And he interprets the bread there mentioned, not of the sacramental bread, but of Christ himself; not of the signs, but of the things signified. Presently after, he quotes part of the words of the institution, 'This is my body,' referring to the Eucharist: and there he does not say that our Lord's body is that bread, (as he had said before, that Christ, or the Logos, is our bread,) but that the Lord's body is understood, or considered, in bread: as much as to say, the Eucharistical bread is by construction that natural body of Christ which is the true bread. And for this he refers not to John vi. but to the words of the institution. Tertullian here joined together the spiritual food mentioned in John vi. in the abstract way, and the same as conveyed in the Eucharist; but he did not interpret John vi. of the Eucharist[d].

It has been suggested by some[e], that Tertullian understood John vi. merely of faith, or doctrine, or spiritual actions: and it is strenuously denied by others[f]. The passage upon which the dispute turns is part of his reply to Marcion; who took a handle from the words, 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' to argue against the resurrection of the body.

'Though he says, "the flesh profiteth nothing," yet the sense is to be governed by the subject-matter. For because they

[d] 'Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie, spiritualiter potius intelligamus: Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus, et vita panis: Ego sum, inquit, panis vitae. Joh. vi. 35. Et paulo supra, v. 33: Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de caelis. Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur: Hoc est corpus meum.' Tertull. de Orat. cap. vi. p. 131.

[e] Dr. Claget, Dr. Whithy, &c. Compare Basnag. Annal. tom. i. p. 320.

[f] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 358, &c.

thought it an hard and intolerable saying, as if he had intended really to give them his flesh to eat; therefore in order to resolve the affair of salvation into the spirit, he premised that "it is the spirit that quickeneth," and then subjoined, that "the flesh profiteth nothing;" namely, towards quickening. He shews also what he would have them understand by spirit: "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," conformable to what he had said before; "he that heareth my words, and believeth in him that sent me, hath everlasting life," &c.—Therefore as he makes the word the quickener, because the word is spirit and life, he calls the same his flesh, inasmuch as the word was made flesh; which consequently is to be hungered after for the sake of life, and to be devoured by the ear, and to be chewed by the understanding, and digested by faith: for a little before also he had pronounced the heavenly bread to be his flesh[f],' &c.

All that one can justly gather from this confused passage is that Tertullian interpreted the bread of life in John vi. of the Word; which he sometimes makes to be vocal, and sometimes substantial, blending the ideas in a very perplexed manner: so that he is no clear authority for construing John vi. of doctrines, &c. All that is certain is, that he supposes the Word made flesh, the Word incarnate, to be the heavenly bread spoken of in that chapter.

There is another place in Tertullian[g], where by flesh and

[f] 'Etsi carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset; ut in spiritum disponeret statum salutis, praemisit, "spiritus est qui vivificat:" atque ita subjunxit "caro nihil prodest;" ad vivificandum scilicet. Exsequitur etiam quid velit intelligi spiritum: "Verba quae locutus sum vobis, spiritus sunt, vita sunt." Sicut et supra, "Qui audit sermones meos, et credit in eum qui me misit, habet vitam aeternam, et in judicium non veniet, sed transiet de morte in vitam." Itaque sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eundem etiam carnem suam dixit, quia et sermo caro erat factus: proinde in causam vitae appetendus, et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus; nam et paulo ante, carnem suam panem quoque caelestem pronuntiarat,' &c. Tertull. de Ressurr. Carn. cap. xxxvii. p. 347.

[g] 'Panis quem ego dedero pro salute mundi, caro mea est. Quod si una caro, et una anima, illa tristis usque ad mortem, et illa panis pro mundi salute; salvus est numerus duarum substantiarum, in suo genere distantium, excludens carnis ae animae unicam speciem.' De Carn. Christi, cap. xiii. p. 319.

bread in John vi. he very plainly understands, not the sacramental, but natural body of Christ, not doctrine, but literally flesh; as indeed our Lord evidently meant it. For as to verses 53, 54, &c., the figure is not in the word 'flesh,' but in the words 'eating and drinking,' as learned men have very justly observed[h]. But then this is to be so understood, that the eating and drinking the natural body and blood amount to receiving the fruits of the blood shed, and body slain; otherwise there is a figure in the words 'body and blood,' as put for the fruits of them, if eating amounts simply to receiving. But I pass on.

Much dispute has been[i] about Origen's construction or constructions (for he has more than one) of John vi. The passages produced in the debate are so many, and the pleadings here and there so diffuse, that it would be tedious to attend every particular. I shall endeavour to select a few critical places, from whence one may competently judge of his sentiments upon the whole thing.

Origen's general observation relating to that chapter is, that it must not be literally, but figuratively understood[k]. He commonly understands the living bread of the Divine Logos, as the true nutriment of the soul[l], the Logos, but considered as incarnate[m]. At other times, he allegorizes the flesh of Christ in a very harsh manner, making it a name for high mysterious

[h] 'Figura autem non est in carne, vera enim Christi caro ad vitam est manducanda: superest igitur ut sit in manducandi vocabulo, quod a corporis organis, ad facultates animae figurate transferatur.' Albertinus, p. 525. 'Caro et sanguis nihil aliud designant quam quod verba prae se ferunt, ac proinde nec aenigma, nec parabola sunt . . . . At id nullo modo evincit vocabulum manducandi non esse metaphoricum, aut manducationem illam de manducatione spirituali non esse intelligendum.' Ibid. 526.

[i] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 360—373.

[k] 'Si secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, "nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum," occidit haec litera.' Orig. in Levit. Hom. vii. p. 225. ed. Bened.

[l] 'Ego sum panis vivus, &c. Qui haec dicebat verbum erat, quo animae pascuntur. . . . . Intuearis quomodo justus semper et sine intermissione manducet de pane vivo, et repleat animam suam, ac satiet eam cibo caelesti, qui est verbum Dei et sapientia ejus.' Orig. in Levit. Hom. xvi. p. 266. ed. Bened.

[m] Αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἀληθὴς βρῶσις, σαρξ Χριστοῦ, ἥτις λόγος οὖσα, γέγονε σάρξ· κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· καὶ ὁ λόγος σαρξ ἐγένετο. Orig. περὶ εὐχ. p. 244.

doctrines[n]. All that he should have said, and probably all that he really meant, was, that the mind is prepared and fitted for enjoying the fruits of Christ's body and blood, the benefits of his passion, by those Divine truths, those heavenly contemplations. He should have distinguished the qualifications for receiving from the thing to be received. Believing in Christ is not enjoying him, but it is in order to it: and the doctrine of the atonement is not the atonement itself, whereon we are to feed. But I return to our author.

In another place he observes, that the blood of Christ may be drank, not only in the use of the Sacraments, but by receiving his words; and he interprets the drinking his blood to mean the embracing his doctrines[o]. Here again he mistakes the means for the end, the qualification for the enjoyment, the duty for the blessing, or reward, just as he did before. However, he is right in judging, that the Sacraments are not the only means, or instruments, in and by which God confers his graces, or applies the atonement, though they are the most considerable.

It should be noted that Origen, in the passage last cited, was commenting upon Numb. xxiii. 24, 'Drink the blood of the slain:' and he had a mind to allegorize it, as his way was, into something evangelical. So he thought first of the blood of Christ; and could he have rested there, he need not have looked beyond the benefits of the grand sacrifice: but it happened that 'slain' was in the plural; and so, to make his allegory hit, he was necessitated to take in more than one; therefore he pitched upon the Apostles to join with Christ, as slain for Christ. The next thing was to interpret blood in such a sense as might equally fit

[n] 'Ubi enim mysticus sermo, ubi dogmaticus et Trinitatis fide repletus profertur et solidus, ubi futuri saeculi, amoto velamine literae, legis spiritualis sacramenta panduntur, ubi spes animae, &c. . . . Haec omnia carnes sunt verbi Dei, quibus qui potest perfecto intellectu vesci, et corde purificato, ille vere festivitatis paschae immolat sacrificium, et diem festum agit cum Deo et angelis ejus.' Orig. Hom. in Num. xxiii. pp. 359, 360.

[o] 'Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus, in quibus vita consistit, sicut et ipse dicit: Verba quae locutus sum, spiritus et vita est. Est ergo ipse vulneratus, cujus nos sanguinem bibimus, id est, doctrinae ejus verba suscipimus.' Orig. in Num. Hom. xvi. p. 334. Cp. Hom. vii. in Levit. p. 225.

both Christ and his Apostles, and so he interpreted it to mean doctrines: and now the 'blood of the slain' turns out, at length, doctrines of the slain, and the allegory becomes complete[p]. I thought it proper thus briefly to hint how Origen fell into that odd construction, because he may be looked upon, in a manner, as the father of it: whatever weight the admired Origen may justly have as to other cases, he can have but little in this, where he manifestly trifled.

I shall cite but one passage more from him; a very remarkable one, and worth the noting. After having spoken of the outward sign of the Eucharist, he goes on thus: 'So much for the typical and symbolical body. But I might also have many things to say of the Logos himself, who became flesh and true food, and of which whosoever eats, he shall live for ever, no wicked man being capable of eating it. For were it possible for an ill man, as such, to feed upon him who was made flesh, the Logos, and the living bread, it would not have been written that whosoever eateth of this bread shall live for ever[q].' Here we may observe, that Origen interprets the true food, and living bread, not of doctrines, nor of the sacramental bread, (the typical, symbolical body,) but of Christ himself, of the Word made flesh: and as to the eating that true food, he understands it of a vital union with the Logos, a spiritual participation of Christ. This is a just construction of John vi., and falls in with that which I have recommended in this chapter. A learned writer, who had taken uncommon pains to shew that the Fathers interpreted John vi. of the Eucharist, was aware that this passage of Origen was far from favouring his hypothesis, and therefore frankly declared that he 'could not pretend to understand it[r];'

[p] 'Sed et illi nihilominus vulnerati sunt, qui nobis verbum ejus praedicarunt. Ipsorum enim, id est, Apostolorum ejus verba cum legimus, et vitam ex eis consequimur, vulneratorum sanguinem bibimus.' Orig. ibid.

[q] Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος· πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρῶσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν. εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μὲν ὄντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Orig. in Matt. p. 254. ed. Huet.

[r] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 373.

observing, however, that it could not at all favour another opinion, espoused by Dr. Whitby and others; meaning the doctrinal interpretation. The truth is, that it favours neither, but directly overthrows both: and had that very ingenious and learned author been aware of any middle opinion, which would stand clear of the difficulties of both extremes, it is more than probable that he would have closed in with it.

Cyprian, who was but a few years later than Origen, comes next to be considered. The most observable passage, so far as concerns our present purpose, occurs in his Exposition of the Lord's Prayer: I have thrown it to the bottom of the page[s], for the learned reader to judge of, and may here save myself the trouble of translating it. But I shall offer a few remarks upon it. 1. Cyprian, in this passage, does not interpret 'bread of life' of the Eucharistical bread, but of Christ himself[t], thrice over. 2. He seems to give the name of Lord's body in the Eucharist to the sacramental bread, as representative and exhibitive of the natural body. 3. But then a communicant must receive worthily, must receive 'jure communicationis,' under a just right to communion, otherwise it is nothing. 4. Therefore it concerns every one to preserve to himself that right by suitable behaviour, and not to incur any just forfeiture by misbehaviour. 5. For, if he incurs just censure, and is justly debarred from communion, he is shut out from Christ. Such is the form and process of

[s] 'Panis vitae Christus est: et panis hic omnium non est, sed noster est.... Christus eorum qui corpus ejus contingunt, panis est. Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et Eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a caelesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur, ipso praedicante et monente: Ego sum panis vitae, qui de caelo descendi: si quis ederit de meo pane, vivet in aeternum. Panis autem quem ego dedero, caro mea est pro saeculi vita. Quando ergo dicit in aeternum vivere si quis ederit de ejus pane, ut manifestum est eos vivere qui corpus ejus attingunt et Eucharistiam jure communicationis accipiunt, ita contra tenendum est et orandum, ne dum quis abstentus separatur a Christi corpore, procul remaneat a salute, comminante ipso et dicente: nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis et biberitis sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Et ideo panem nostrum, id est, Christum, dari nobis quotidie petimus, ut qui in Christo manemus et vivimus, a sanctificatione ejus et corpore non recedamus.' Cypr. de Orat. Domin. pp. 209, 210. ed. Bened.; alias 146, 147.

[t] Compare Albertinus, pp. 377, 378.

Cyprian's reasoning: and it must be owned that John vi. is very pertinently alleged by him, in order to convince every serious Christian of the necessity of his continuing in a state fit for the reception of the holy Communion, and not such as shall disqualify him for it. For since our Lord there lays so great a stress upon eating his flesh and drinking his blood; and since communicating worthily is one way of doing it; and since, if we are rendered morally unfit for that, we must of course be morally unfit for all other ways, and so totally debarred from feeding upon Christ at all, for life and happiness: these things considered, it is very obvious to perceive that John vi., though not particularly pointing to the Eucharist, is yet reductively applicable to it, in the way of argumentation, and is of very great force for the exciting Christians to a reverential regard for it, and to a solicitous care that they may never, by any fault of theirs, be debarred from it. In short, though John vi. doth not directly speak of the Eucharist, yet Christians, in the due use of that sacrament, do that which is there mentioned, do really eat his flesh and drink his blood, in the spiritual sense there intended; therefore Cyprian had good reason to quote part of that chapter, and to apply the same as pertinent to the Eucharist, in the way of just inference from it, upon known Christian principles.

Cyprian elsewhere quotes John vi. 53, ['except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,'] in order to enforce the necessity of Baptism[u]. Either he thought that the spiritual feeding, mentioned in St. John, was common both to Baptism and the Eucharist, and might be indifferently obtained in either sacrament: or else the turn of his thought was this, that as there is no life without the Eucharist, and as Baptism must go before the Eucharist, Baptism must of course be necessary in order to come at the kingdom of God. If this last was Cyprian's thought, then indeed he interpreted

[u] 'Ad regnum Dei nisi baptizatus et renatus fuerit pervenire non posse. In Evangelio cata Johannem. Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c. Item illic: Nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis et biberitis sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis.' Cypr. Testimon. lib. iii. c. 25. p. 314.

John vi. directly of the Eucharist: but I incline to understand him according to the other view first mentioned; and the rather because we shall find the same confirmed by the African Fulgentius, in his turn.

Novatian of the same age appears to understand John vi. of spiritual manducation at large, feeding upon a right faith (which of course must take in faith in the merits of Christ's passion) and conscience undefiled, and an innocency of soul. He refers to John vi. 27, and immediately after adds, that righteousness and continence, and the other virtues, are the worship which God requires: he had before intimated that they were the true, the holy, and the clean food[x]. But, I presume, all this was to be so understood as not to exclude the salutary virtue of Christ's atonement: only the subject he was then upon led him not to speak plainly of it. In another work, he understands Christ himself to be the bread of life, and makes it an argument of his Divinity[y], referring to John vi. 51. So that if we take the author's whole sense on this head, Christ or the fruits of his death, together with our own faith and virtues, are our bread of life, our spiritual food, as taught in John vi.

We may now come down to the fourth century, where we shall meet with Eusebius, a writer of considerable note. His common way is to interpret the bread of life, or heavenly bread, of Christ himself, of the heavenly Logos become incarnate[z]. He understands John vi. of spiritual eating, and intimates that Judas received the bread from heaven, the nutriment of the soul: not meaning what he said of Judas's receiving the sacramental bread in the Eucharist; but, I conceive, his meaning

[x] 'Cibus, inquam, verus, et sanctus, et mundus est fides recta, immaculata conscientia, et innocens anima. Quisquis sic pascitur, Christo convescitur: talis epulator conviva est Dei; istae sunt epulae quae angelos pascunt; istae sunt mensae quae martyres faciunt. . . . Hinc illa Christi, Operamini autem non escam quae perit, sed escam permanentem in vitam aeternam, quam filius hominis vobis dabit; hunc enim Pater signavit Deus. Justitia, inquam, et continentia, et reliquis Deus virtutibus colitur.' Novat. de Cib. Judaic. c. v. p. 140. ed. Welchm.

[y] 'Si homo tantummodo Christus, quomodo refert, Ego sum panis vitae aeternae, &c. . . . cum neque panis vitae homo esse possit, ipse mortalis,' &c. Novat. de Trin. c. xiv. p. 46; cp. c. xvi. p. 54.

[z] Eusebius in Psalm. pp. 81, 267, 471. In Isa. p. 586.

was, that Judas had been blessed with heavenly instructions and Divine graces, though he made an ill use of them. He had tasted of the heavenly gift, of the blessed influences of the Divine Logos, but fell away notwithstanding [a].

Eusebius, in another place, interprets flesh and blood in John vi. of our Lord's mystical body and blood, as opposed to natural [b]. And when he comes afterwards to explain this mystical body and blood, he interprets the same of words and doctrines [c], grounding his exposition on John vi. 63, 'The words that I speak,' &c. A learned author [d] endeavours to make Eusebius contradict himself in the same chapter: but he is consistent so far, which will evidently appear to any one that reads him with attention. However, I think his interpretation of John vi. to be forced and wide. It was very odd to make doctrines the mystical body and blood, and to say, that the doctrines, or words then spoken, were what our Lord intended afterwards to 'give for the life of the world:' such construction appears altogether harsh and unnatural. Besides, since Eusebius interpreted 'bread of life' of our Lord's Divine nature, he ought certainly to have understood that bread, which our Lord was to give, to be the human nature, the natural body and blood. But my business here is not so much to dispute as to report: and it is plain enough that Eusebius followed Origen in this matter, and that both of them favoured the same mystical or allegorical construction; whether constantly and uniformly, I need not say.

Athanasius was contemporary with Eusebius, as a young man with one grown into years. He occasionally gives us his thoughts upon John vi. 61, 62, 63, in these words: 'Here he has made mention of both, as meeting in himself, both flesh and

[a] Συνέστιος δὲ ὢν τῷ διδασκάλῳ, οὐ τὸν κοινὸν ἄρτον αὐτῷ μόνον συνέσθιεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς θρεπτικοῦ μεταλαμβάνειν ἠξιοῦτο· περὶ οὗ ἔλεγεν ὁ σωτήρ· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Euseb. in Psalm. p. 171.

[b] Οὐ περὶ ἧς ἀνείληφε σαρκὸς διελέγετο, περὶ δὲ τοῦ μυστικοῦ σώματός τε καὶ αἵματος. Euseb. Eccles. Theol. contr. Marcell. p. 179.

[c] Ὥστε αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα, ὧν ὁ μετέχων ἀεὶ, ὡσανεὶ ἄρτῳ οὐρανίῳ τρεφόμενος, τῆς οὐρανίου μεθέξει ζωῆς. Euseb. ibid. p. 180.

[d] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 373, 374.

spirit; and he has distinguished the spirit from the flesh, that they believing not only the visible part of him, but the invisible also, might learn that his discourse was not carnal, but spiritual. For, how many men must the body have sufficed for food, if it were to have fed all the world? But for that very reason he intimated beforehand the Son of man's ascension into heaven, to draw them off from corporeal imaginations, and to teach them that the flesh which he had been speaking of, was to be heavenly meat from above, and spiritual food, which he would give them: For, says he, the words which I have spoken, they are spirit and life. As much as to say, That which outwardly appears, and is to be given for the salvation of the world, is this flesh which I bear about me: but this, with the blood thereof, shall be by me spiritually given for food, spiritually dispensed to every one, for a preservative unto all, to secure to them a resurrection to life eternal[e].' Thus far he. The observations which I have hereupon to offer are as follow: 1. Our author very justly construes the flesh which Christ was to give, of his natural body; and supposes no figure in the word flesh. 2. He as rightly supposes some figure to lie in the words 'given for meat,' which he would have to be spiritually understood. 3. The spiritual, or hidden meaning, according to our author, is, that the flesh is joined with spirit, the humanity with the Divinity, and therefore in the giving his flesh to eat, he at the same time imparts his Divinity with the happy influences of it. 4. The flesh, or human nature, being all that was seen, we ought to raise our minds up to the Divinity united to it, and veiled under it; and so may we spiritually feast upon it, and be sealed to a happy resurrection by it.

Such is Athanasius's comment upon John vi., worthy of himself, and (like most other things of his) neat, clear, and judicious. Here is not one word of the Eucharist: neither do I see any certain grounds to persuade us that he had it in his mind; though I am sensible that the generality of the learned do conceive that he had[f]. The thought appears juster and

[e] Athanas. Epist. iv. ad Serapion. p. 710. ed. Bened.

[f] The reader may compare, if he pleases, Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, (part i. pp. 167, 374,) which interprets Athanasius of the Eucharist.

finer [g], without that supposition, than with it, so that there is no necessity at all for it. He could hardly understand 'flesh' of Christ's natural flesh, and still imagine it to be given in the Eucharist, unless he had added, virtually, constructionally, or in effect, which he does not: his construction of 'spiritual' is, that our Lord's Divine spirit goes along with that natural flesh, to make it salutary food to us. Besides, to interpret our Lord's giving his flesh 'for the life of the world,' of his giving it symbolically in the Eucharist (rather than really on the cross), is too low and too jejune a sense to be fathered upon a person of his great discernment. Add to this, that he speaks expressly of spiritual manducation, not of oral or corporal, and therefore cannot be understood to interpret John vi. of sacramental eating and drinking[h]. My persuasion therefore is, that the passage relates not at all to the Eucharist, but to our Lord's becoming man, in order to bring us up to God; or, in short, to his taking our humanity, and making an atonement for us, in order to feast us with his Divinity, and so to raise us up to himself. In another place, Athanasius distinguishes the bread which is Christ, from the bread which Christ gives (referring to John vi.), and he resolves the latter into the flesh of our Lord, but as operating in virtue of the Holy Spirit. He observes, that we receive that heavenly bread here, as the firstfruits of what we are to receive hereafter, inasmuch as we receive the flesh of Christ, which is a quickening spirit [i]. He had before supposed that Christ had insinuated the

However, it is very certain, that this passage is no way favourable to those who would construe John vi. of precepts or doctrines.

[g] He seems to express the same thought, where, without any view to the Eucharist, he says: 'As our Lord by putting on a body was made man, so are we men made divine by the Logos, being assumed through his flesh, and so of consequence heirs to eternal life.' *Ὡς γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐνδυσάμενος τὸ σῶμα γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος· οὕτως ἡμεῖς καὶ ἄνθρωποι παρὰ τοῦ λόγου τε θεοποιούμεθα, προσληφθέντες διὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ λοιπὸν ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομοῦμεν.* Athanas. Orat. iii. p. 584. Cp. Sermo Major. in Nov. Collect. pp. 6, 7. de Incarnat. contra Arian. pp. 874, 876.

[h] Vid. Chamier, de Eucharist. lib. xi. c. 5. p. 613.

[i] *Ὅτι πάλιν ὁ Κύριος λέγει περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. ἀλλαχοῦ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καλεῖ ἄρτον οὐράνιον, λέγων· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· ἐδίδαξε γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ εὐχῇ ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι αἰτεῖν τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, τουτέστι τὸν μέλλοντα, οὗ ἀπαρχὴν ἔχομεν ἐν τῇ νῦν*

union of the Logos with his humanity, and now here he supposes that a conjunction of the Spirit is insinuated likewise; since the Logos and the Spirit are inseparable. But nothing is here said directly of the Eucharist; so that it cannot be hence certainly inferred that Athanasius interpreted John vi. of the Eucharist, or that he so much as applied it that way: his thoughts, in both these passages, seem to have been intent upon quite another thing. A learned man, to make this last passage look the more favourable to his scheme, renders part of it thus: 'We have the firstfruits of the future repast in this present life, in the communion of the body of our Lord [k]:' where the whole force of the plea lies in the phrase 'communion of the Lord's body,' and the idea which it is apt to convey to an English reader. Let but the place be rendered literally, 'partaking of the flesh of the Lord [l],' and the idea vanishes. It is certain, that flesh there means natural flesh, not sacramental, or symbolical; because it is the firstfruits of the future repast, (which will be real, not sacramental,) and means, according to our author, partaking of the Holy Spirit. Therefore one would wonder how any attentive reader should conceive that Athanasius here speaks directly and positively, or at all, of oral manducation. That he speaks of spiritual manducation is self-evident: and he might mean it of spiritual manducation at large; for he says nothing of the Eucharist in particular, to confine it to that single form or instance of it.

Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Lectures to the uninitiated, interprets John vi. 64 of good doctrine [m]. But in what

ζωῆ, τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου μεταλαμβάνοντες, καθὼς αὐτὸς εἶπε· ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, πνεῦμα γὰρ ζωοποιοῦν ἡ σάρξ ἐστι τοῦ Κυρίου. Athan. de Incarn. p. 883.

[k] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 375.

[l] It is a thought which Athanasius dwells much upon, that Christ took our flesh upon him, to make himself one with us; and that we are partakers of him, by being partakers of the same flesh. Orat. iii. pp. 571, 572, 573, 582, 583, 588. Sermo Major. p. 7. de Incarn. contr. Arian. p. 875.

[m] *Περὶ δὲ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος λέγει· τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι, καὶ ζωή ἐστιν· ἀντὶ τοῦ πνευματικά ἐστι. . . . . Τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστιν· ἵνα μὴ λαλιὰν χειλέων τοῦτο εἶναι νομίσῃς, ἀλλὰ τὴν καλὴν διδασκαλίαν.* Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xvi. sect. 13, 14. pp. 250, 251.

he says to the initiated, he applies John vi. 54 to the Eucharist[n]. To reconcile both places, or both constructions, we may fairly presume that he supposed our Saviour, in verse the 64th, to intimate, that what he had said was, in the general, true and sublime doctrine, but withal spiritual; and in verse the 54th, to intimate, that his flesh and blood were to be spiritually fed upon by the faithful. Thus both parts are consistent: for this doctrine of spiritual manducation was spiritual doctrine. And Cyril here applies that very doctrine to the case of the Eucharist, because he had ground sufficient, from other Scriptures, to conclude, that such spiritual manducation was a privilege of that sacrament, though not of that only. So he did not directly interpret John vi. of the Eucharist, but he so applied it, and that very properly.

Hilary, of that time, undertaking to prove that we are one with Christ by a closer union than bare will and consent amount to, draws an argument from the sacrament of the Eucharist (as he does likewise in the same place from the sacrament of Baptism) to prove a real and permanent, but spiritual union between Christ and his true members. The thread of his argument is this: In and by the eucharistical food, we spiritually receive the Word incarnate, and are mystically united with the natural flesh and blood of Christ, our bodies with his body: and we are thereby truly and substantially (therefore not in consent only) united with Christ[o]. To confirm the reality of such union, he appeals to John vi. 55, 56, 'My flesh is meat indeed; he that eateth my flesh, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' It is observable that he distinguishes the eucharistical food from the food mentioned in John vi., for in or by the former we receive the latter, according to him. Therefore he does not interpret John vi. of the Eucharist; but, taking it for an acknowledged principle, that by the due use of one we come at the other, he pertinently

[n] Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xxii. Mystagog. iv. c. 4. pp. 520, 521.

[o] 'Si enim vere verbum caro factum est, et vere nos verbum carnem cibo Dominico sumimus; quomodo non naturaliter manere in nobis existimandus est &c.... vere, sub mysterio carnem corporis sui sumimus.' Hilar. de Trin. lib. viii. sect. 13. p. 954. Cp. Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. xlvi. pp. 272, 273. Bened. Cyrill. Alex. de Trin. Dial. i. p. 407. And compare my Charge, vol. v. p. 1113.

accommodates or applies the doctrine of John vi. to the Eucharist. In a word, Hilary does not teach that the Eucharist is that flesh and blood of Christ mentioned in John vi., but that the flesh and blood there mentioned is received in or by the Eucharist, is spiritually or mystically received; 'sub mysterio,' as he expresses it [p].

Basil says, 'It is good and profitable to communicate daily of the sacred body and blood of Christ, since he himself plainly says, He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life [q].' He argues justly, because the consideration drawn from John vi. is and ought to be of great force: not that John vi. speaks of the outward Sacrament, but of spiritual manducation at large, and of inward grace; which, as we learn from other Scriptures, does ordinarily (where there is no impediment) go along with the Sacrament. Basil therefore does not interpret John vi. of the Sacrament, but he applies the general doctrine there taught to one particular instance whereunto it ordinarily belongs: elsewhere he interprets it of spiritual (not oral) manducation of the flesh of Christ [r].

Gregory Nyssen is sometimes cited [s] as one that interprets John vi. of the Eucharist; but upon slender presumptions, without any proof. Macarius also is made another voucher [t], and with little or no colour for it. Ambrose is a third [u]: and yet

[p] 'Ipse enim ait, caro mea vere est esca &c....Ipsius Domini professione, et fide nostra, vere caro est, et vere sanguis est: et haec accepta atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit.' Ibid. sect. 14. p. 956. If any one wants to see the whole argument cleared and vindicated, against such as hold the corporal presence, he may consult Albertine, p. 411, &c. or Bishop Moreton, pp. 358–374, or Chanier, p. 648, &c.

[q] Τὸ κοινωνεῖν δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καλὸν καὶ ἐπωφελές· αὐτοῦ σαφῶς λέγοντος, ὁ τρώγων μοῦ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μοῦ τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Basil. Epist. 289.

[r] Basil. in Psalm. xxxiii. 8.

[s] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 385. It is argued, that Greg. Nyssen. must have understood John vi. of the Eucharist, because he made it a pledge of the resurrection; which is no argument at all, as was observed under Ignatius and Irenaeus.

[t] Johnson, p. 385. Vid. Macar. Orat. iv. p. 22.

N.B. Macarius may as reasonably be thought to interpret John iv. 14 of the Eucharist, as John vi. in that place. It is absurd to imagine that he so interpreted either; unless he supposed Moses (whom he there mentions) to have received the Eucharist.

[u] Johnson, ibid. Ambrose there plainly distinguishes the sacramental bread from the bread mentioned in John vi.

neither does he speak home to the point, as every careful reader may soon see. I pass them over for the sake of brevity.

Jerome interprets the heavenly bread of Christ himself, and calls it angels' food; intimating thereby that it is eaten in heaven, but plainly teaching that it was eaten by the Patriarchs of old, and is now eaten, not only in the Eucharist, but in the sacrament of Baptism[x]. From all which it is evident that he interpreted John vi. of spiritual feeding at large. It is a mistake to imagine[y] that he meant sacramental bread and wine, where he speaks of the wheat of which the heavenly bread is made, and of the wine which is Christ's blood[z]. All he intended was, that the wheat and the wine, mentioned in the prophecy of Isaiah, mystically pointed to the real flesh and blood of Christ; who is himself that wheat which makes the heavenly bread, according to his own allusion, where he resembles himself to wheat falling and bearing much fruit[a].

Chrysostom interprets John vi. 51 of Christ's natural body, not of the sacramental[b]. Elsewhere, distinguishing between the bread which is Christ, and the bread which Christ gives, he interprets the former of our Lord's Divine nature[c]: of the latter he offers a twofold construction, so as to comprehend both our Lord's own natural body, and any salutary doctrines, inasmuch as both of them strengthen the soul[d]. He takes notice that our

[x] 'Panis qui de caelo descendit corpus est Domini, et vinum quod discipulis dedit, sanguis illius est Novi Testamenti &c.... Nec Moyses dedit nobis panem verum, sed Dominus Jesus: ipse conviva et convivium, ipse comedens et quod comeditur.... Hunc panem et Jacob Patriarcha comedere cupiebat, dicens, Si fuerit Dominus mecum, et dederit mihi panem ad vescendum &c.... Quotquot enim in Christo baptizamur, Christum induimus, et panem comedimus angelorum, et audimus Dominum precantem, meus cibus est, ut faciam' &c. Hieron. Hedibiae, tom. iv. pp. 171, 172. ed. Bened.

[y] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 376.

[z] 'Triticum quoque de quo panis caelestis efficitur, illud est de quo loquitur Dominus, Caro mea vere est cibus: rursumque de vino, Et sanguis meus vere est potus.' Hieron. in Isa. c. lxii. p. 462.

[a] John xii. 24. Compare Jerome in Ose. c. vii. p. 1285.

[b] 'Ὑπὲρ τούτων τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέχεεν αἷμα, ὑπὲρ τούτων τὴν σφαγὴν κατεδέξατο. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος, φησὶν, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστὶν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. Chrysost. de Anathemate, tom. i. p. 692. ed. Bened. Cp. Hom. xlv. in Joan. p. 271.

[c] Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. xliv. p. 264; cited above, p. 103. [note s.] Cp. Hom. xlv. p. 270.

[d] Ἄρτον δὲ ἤτοι τὰ δόγματα λέγει

Lord there speaks of spiritual food[e], and that by the Eucharistical food we partake of the spiritual, and become really one with Christ[f]. The thought is the same with what we have seen in Hilary before cited: and it proves very evidently, that Chrysostom did not understand the food spoken of in John vi. of the sacramental food, since he makes them as distinct as means and end, or as the instrumental cause and principal, while he supposes that by the due use of one we come at the other. I shall not now give myself the trouble of particularly examining every plea that has been offered, or every passage that has been alleged[g], to make Chrysostom appear favourable to another hypothesis. If the reader does but bear in mind the proper distinction between interpreting of the Eucharist, and applying a text or texts to the Eucharist, he will need no further solution. I shall only observe further, that no one of the later Fathers has better expressed the true and full meaning of our Lord in John vi., than Cyril of Alexandria has done, where he teaches, that 'no soul can ever attain to freedom from sin, or escape the tyranny of Satan, or arrive to the city above, but by participating of Christ, and of his philanthropy[h];' presently after quoting John vi. 53 (together with John viii. 34) in proof of what he had said.

Hitherto we have seen nothing in the Fathers that can be justly thought clear and determinate in favour of oral manducation, as directly and primarily intended in John vi. Many, or most, of them have applied that general doctrine of spiritual feeding to the particular case of the Eucharist, because we are spiritually fed therein: but they have not interpreted that chapter directly of the Eucharist, because it has not one word of the outward signs or symbols of the spiritual food, but abstracts from all, and rests in the general doctrine of the use and

ἐνταῦθα τὰ σωτήρια, καὶ τὴν πίστιν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν, ἢ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. ἀμφότερα γὰρ νευροῖ τὴν ψυχήν. Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. xlv. p. 270.

[e] Μέμνηται τροφῆς πνευματικῆς. Ibid. 271.

[f] Μὴ μόνον κατὰ τὴν ἀγάπην γενώμεθα ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα, εἰς ἐκείνην ἀνακερασθῶμεν τὴν σάρκα· διὰ τῆς τροφῆς γὰρ τοῦτο γίνεται, ἧς ἐχαρίσατο. Ibid. p. 272.

[g] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 384.

[h] Εἰ μὴ διὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ μετοχῆς καὶ φιλανθρωπίας &c. Cyrill. Alexandr. Glaph. in Exod. ii. de Host. Agni, p. 267.

necessity of spiritual nutriment, the blood of Christ, in some shape or other, to everlasting salvation. Thus stood the case, both in the Greek and Latin churches, for the first four centuries, or somewhat more. But about the beginning of the fifth century arose some confusion. The frequent applying of John vi. to the Eucharist came at length to make many, among the Latins especially, interpret it directly of the Eucharist: and now some thought John vi. 53 as decisive a text for the necessity of the Eucharist, as John iii. 5 was for the necessity of Baptism. Hereupon ensued a common practice of giving the Communion to mere infants. Pope Innocent I. is believed to have been the first or principal man that brought up such doctrine of the necessity of communicating infants[i]: he was made Bishop of Rome A. D. 402. It appears very probable, that from the time of his Synodical Epistle, A. D. 417, the doctrine generally ran, in the Latin churches at least, that 'unless you receive the Eucharist, you have no life in you.' St. Austin is supposed to have construed the text in that way, especially from the time of Pope Innocent[k]. But in some places of his works he interprets that chapter, or some parts of it, with clearer and better judgment. Particularly in his Doctrina Christiana, lib. iii. cap. 16, quoted above[l]: and also in another work of his, where he plainly distinguishes the Sacrament of Christ's body from the spiritual food mentioned in John vi.[m] There are two noted passages of his, where he seems to interpret the living bread of

[i] See Wall's Hist. of Infant Baptism, part ii. ch. 9. p. 441, &c. 3rd ed. Defence, pp. 36, 384. Bingham, b. xv. c. 4. sect. 7. Compare Mr. Pierce's Essay on Infant Communion, who carries it much higher than others, upon suggestions which bear a plausible appearance, and are worth examining by some person of learning and leisure. But in the meanwhile, I acquiesce in Dr. Wall's account, as one that was well considered, and which, in my opinion, cannot be far from the truth.

[k] See Wall, ibid. pp. 441, 442, 443. Vossius, Hist. Pelag. lib. ii. part. 3. p. 167. But Thorndike disputes it, [Epilog. p. 176, &c. De Jur. Finiend. p. 285,] with some show of reason.

[l] See above, p. 91. [note h.]

[m] 'Panis quotidianus aut pro iis omnibus dictus est quae hujus vitae necessitatem sustentant, aut pro Sacramento corporis Christi quod quotidie accipimus, aut pro spirituali cibo de quo idem Dominus dicit, Ego sum panis,' &c. August. de Sermone Domini in Monte, lib. ii. c. 7. Cp. de Civit. Dei, lib. xxi. c. 25.

eating doctrine, of believing only[n]: but he only seems to do so, when he really does not. For he intends no more than this, that faith is the mean whereby we receive that living bread; it is the qualification requisite for the reception of it[o]. A man must have had faith to be healed, as we often read in the Gospels; and healing certainly followed upon the faith of the person: and it might be right to say, Believe, and thou art healed: but yet faith and the cure following were not the same thing, but very distinct, both in nature and notion[p].

It may be proper to go on to Fulgentius of the next age, A. D. 507, a great admirer and follower of St. Austin, to see how this matter stood among the Africans in his time. He had a question put to him, upon a scruple raised from John vi. 53, concerning the case of such as having been baptized, happened to be prevented by death from receiving the holy Communion: and he determined that they were safe, because Baptism exhibits the body and blood of Christ to faithful recipients, as well as the Eucharist[q]. He strengthens his determination of the case by the authority of St. Austin, in a long citation from him: and at length concludes, that receiving Baptism is receiving the body and blood of Christ, because it is receiving the thing signified in the other sacrament[r]. He certainly judged very right: and it

[n] 'Quid paras dentes, et ventrem? Crede, et manducasti. Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum.' August. in Joan. tract. 25, 26. 'Augustinus hunc cibum tripliciter interpretatur: videlicet de propria Domini carne, .. interdum etiam de Sacramento carnis hujus; nonnunquam de societate fidelium.' Albertin. pp. 691, 699.

[o] 'Non perspexit ... ab Augustino ipso, his verbis, fidem ut causam, manducationem vero ipsam spiritualem ut effectum inter se conferri et collocari. Alioqui, si credere, et manducare una et eadem res esset ex Augustini mente, quid hac oratione fuerit ineptius? Crede et manducasti, id est, manduca et manducasti.' Lamb. Danaei Apolog. pro Helvet. Eccl. p. 1477. Opusc. ed. Genev. Cp. Calvin. Institut. lib. iv. c. 17. p. 280.

[p] Compare Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 377.

[q] 'In ipso lavacro sanctae regenerationis hoc fieri providebit. Quid enim agitur sacramento sancti Baptismatis, nisi ut credentes membra Domini nostri Jesu Christi fiant, et ad compagem corporis ejus ecclesiastica unitate pertineant? ... Tunc incipit unusquisque particeps esse illius unius panis, quando coeperit memor esse illius unius corporis,' &c.

[r] 'Unumquemque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Dominici participem fieri, quando in Baptismate membrum esse illius corporis Christi efficitur, nec alienari ab illo panis calicisve consortio, etiamsi antequam

is an instance to shew how plain good sense overruled, though it did not abolish, a wrong interpretation of John vi., and removed, in some measure, the uneasy scruples arising naturally from the then prevailing construction. The proper inference from Fulgentius's wise and wary resolution of the case is, that John vi. ought not to be rigorously understood of any particular way of spiritual feeding, but simply of spiritual feeding, be it in what way soever: be it by Baptism, or by the Eucharist, or by any other sacraments, (as under the old law,) or by any kind of means which divine wisdom shall choose, or has in Scripture signified.

From this summary view of the ancients it may be observed, that they varied sometimes in their constructions of John vi. or of some parts of it: but what prevailed most, and was the general sentiment wherein they united, was, that Christ himself is properly and primarily our bread of life, considered as the Word made flesh, as God incarnate, and dying for us; and that whatever else might, in a secondary sense, be called heavenly bread, (whether sacraments, or doctrines, or any holy service,) it was considered but as an antepast to the other, or as the same thing in the main, under a different form of expression.

I shall here throw in a few words concerning the sentiments of moderns before I close this chapter. Albertinus[s] will furnish the reader with a competent list of Schoolmen, and others of the Roman communion, who have rejected the sacramental interpretation of John vi. A more summary account of the same may be seen in Archbishop Wake[t], in the collection of pamphlets written against Popery in a late reign. I know not whether the authorities of that kind may be looked upon as so many concessions from that quarter, (though the Romanists,

panem illum comedat, et calicem bibat, de hoc saeculo in unitate corporis Christi constitutus abscedat. Sacramenti quippe illius participatione et beneficio non privatur, quando ipse hoc quod illud sacramentum significat invenitur.' Fulgent. ibid. pp. 227, 228. Cp. Cyrill. Alexandr. Glaphyr. in Exod. lib. ii. p. 270. in Joan. ix. 6. p. 602.

[s] Albertinus de Eucharistia, lib. i. c. 30. p. 209.

[t] Discourse of the Eucharist, printed in 1687, p. 20. He numbers up thirty in all, thus: two popes, four cardinals, two archbishops, five bishops, the rest doctors and professors.

generally, contend earnestly for the sacramental construction,) because there may be reasons why the more considering Romanists should think it prudent to give another construction, inasmuch as John vi., if interpreted directly of the Eucharist, would furnish a strong argument for infant communion, which they have long laid aside; and it would be diametrically opposite to a noted principle of theirs, of denying the cup to the laity. I cannot say how far these two considerations may have inclined the shrewder men amongst them to reject what I call the sacramental construction of John vi.

But the Reformers, in general, for very weighty reasons, have rejected the same: the Lutherans and Calvinists abroad, and our own most early and most considerable Divines, have concurred in discarding it. It would be tedious to enter into a particular recital of authorities; and so I shall content myself with pointing out two or three of the most eminent, who may justly be allowed to speak for the rest. Archbishop Cranmer stands at the head of them: he had considered that matter as closely perhaps as any man before or after him, and determined in the main as judiciously. He writes thus:

'Whoe ever said or taught before this tyme, that the Sacrament was the cause why Christ said, Yf wee eat not the fleshe of the Sonne of man, wee have not lyfe in us? The spiritual eating of his flesh, and drincking of his bloud by faith, by digesting his death in our myndes, as our only pryce, raunsom, and redemption from eternal dampnation, is the cause wherfore Christe sayd, that If wee eat not his fleshe, and drincke not his bloud, we have not lyfe in us: and If wee eat his fleshe and drincke his bloud, wee have everlasting lyfe. And if Christ had never ordeyned the Sacrament, yet should wee have eaten his fleshe and dronken his bloud, and have had thereby everlasting lyfe, as al the faithful dyd before the Sacrament was ordeyned, and doe daily, when thei receave not the Sacrament.... That in the vi. of John Christ spake nether of corporall nor sacramental eating of his fleshe, the tyme manifestly sheweth. For Christ spake of the same present tyme that was then, saying: The bread which I will give is my fleshe, &c. At whyche tyme

the sacramental bread was not yet Christes fleshe: for the Sacrament was not yet ordeyned; and yet at that tyme, all that beleved in Christ did eat his flesh and drincke his bloud, or elles thei coulde not have dwelled in Christ, nor Christ in them[u].

'This symilityde caused oure Saviour to say, My fleshe is very meate, and my bloud is very drynke. For there is no kynde of meate that is comfortable to the soule, but only the death of Christes blessed body; nor no kynde of drynke that can quenche her thirst, but only the bloude sheddyng of our Saviour Christ which was shed for her offences[x].

'I mervail here not a litle of Mr. Smith's either dulnes or maliciousnes, that cannot or will not see, that Christ in this chapter of St. John spake not of sacramental bread, but of heavenly bread; nor of his flesh only, but also of his bloud, and of his Godhead, calling them heavenly bread that giveth everlasting life. So that he spake of himselfe wholly, saying, I am the bread of life, &c. And nether spake he of common bread, nor yet of sacramental bread, for nether of them was given upon the crosse for the lyfe of the world. And there can be nothing more manifest, than that in this sixth chapter of St. John, Christ spake not of the Sacrament of his flesh, but of his very flesh. And that as wel for that the Sacrament was not then instituted, as also because Christ said not in the future tense, The bread which I will give *shall be* my flesh, but in the present tense, The bread which I will give *is* my flesh: which sacramental bread was neither then his flesh, nor was then instituted for a sacrament, nor was after given for the life of the world. . . . When he said, The bread which I wil give is my flesh, &c., he meant nether of the materiall bread, nether of the accidents of bread, but of his own flesh: which although of itself it availeth nothinge, yet being in unity of Person joyned unto his Divinity, it is the same heavenly bread that he gave to death upon the crosse for the life of the world[y].'

[u] Archbishop Cranmer on the Sacrament, p. 22.

[x] Cranmer, p. 41. Cp. Calvin. in Joan. vi. 54.

[y] Cranmer, p. 450. Compare Bishop Jewel, Defence of Apology, p. 306, &c. Answer to Harding, pp. 78, 239, 240. Fryth, Answer to More, pp. 21, 27.

Thus far that excellent person has shewn, by convincing reasons drawn from the chapter itself, that John vi. ought not to be interpreted of the Eucharist. Nevertheless, he very well knew, and did not forget to observe, that it may properly be applied or accommodated to the Eucharist, and is of great weight and force for that very purpose.

'As the bread is outwardlie eaten indeede in the Lordes Supper, so is the very body of Christ inwardly by faith eaten indede of all them that come thereto in such sorte as thei ought to doe; which eating nourysheth them unto everlasting lyfe. And this eating hath a warrant signed by Christ himselfe in the vi. of John, where Christ saith, He that eateth my flesh, and drincketh my bloud, hath lyfe everlasting[z]. You be the first that ever excluded the wordes of Christe from his Supper. And St. Augustine mente, as well at the Supper, as at all other tymes, that the eating of Christes flesh is not to be understanded carnally with our teeth[a],' &c.

The sum then of Archbishop Cranmer's doctrine on this head is: 1. That John vi. is not to be interpreted of oral manducation in the Sacrament, nor of spiritual manducation as confined to the Eucharist, but of spiritual manducation at large, in that or any other sacrament, or out of the Sacraments. 2. That spiritual manducation, in that chapter, means the feeding upon Christ's death and passion, as the price of our redemption and salvation. 3. That in so feeding we have a spiritual or mystical union with his human nature, and by that with his Godhead, to which his humanity is joined in an unity of Person. 4. That such spiritual manducation is a privilege belonging to the Eucharist, and therefore John vi. is not foreign to the Eucharist, but has such relation to it as the inward thing signified bears to the outward signs.

To Archbishop Cranmer I may subjoin Peter Martyr, who about ten years after engaged in the same cause, in a large Latin treatise printed A. D. 1562. No man has more clearly shewn, in few words, how far John vi. belongs not to the Eucharist, and how far it does. He considers the general principles

[z] Cranmer, p. 11. [a] Ibid. p. 35.

there taught as being preparatory to the institution of the Eucharist, which was to come after. Our Lord in that chapter gave intimation of spiritual food, with the use and necessity of it: afterwards, in the institution, he added external symbols, for the notifying one particular act or instance of spiritual manducation, to make it the more solemn and the more affecting. Therefore John vi., though not directly spoken of the Eucharist, yet is by no means foreign, but rather looks forward towards it, bears a tacit allusion to it, and serves to reflect light upon it: for which reason the ancient Fathers are to be commended for connecting the account of inward grace with the outward symbols, the thing signified with the signs afterwards added, and so applying the discourse of that chapter to the case of the Eucharist [b].

From what has been observed of these two eminent Reformers, we may judge how John vi. was understood at that time: not of doctrines, nor of sacramental feeding, but of spiritual feeding at large, feeding upon the death and passion of Christ our Lord. This, I think, has been the prevailing construction of our own Divines all along: and though it has been much obscured of late (for half a century, perhaps, or more) by one or other hypothesis, yet has it never been lost[c], neither, I suppose, ever will be.

[b] 'De sexto capite Joannis, an ad Eucharistiam pertineat, nos ita respondemus. Sermonem ibi de Sacramento coenae non institui; ibi enim coena cum symbolis non ordinatur. Nam nec panis, nec calicis, nec gratiarum actionis, nec fractionis, nec distributionis, nec testamenti, nec memoriae, nec annuntiationis mortis Christi mentio ulla eo loco instituitur. Huc spectabant illi, qui dixerunt illud caput ad Eucharistiam non pertinere, &c. Quoniam res ipsa (id est, corporis et sanguinis Christi spiritualis manducatio et potus) ibi luculenter traditur, ad quam postea Evangelistae, ad finem historiae suae, declarant Christum adjunxisse symbola externa panis et vini, idcirco nos caput illud a Sacramento Eucharistae non putamus esse alienum... Imo Patres illos libenter recipimus, qui illa verba ad hoc negotium transtulerunt. Quid enim aliud sibi volunt panis et vinum, quae postea addita sunt in coena, nisi ut magis excitemur ad manducationem illam corporis et sanguinis Domini, quae multis verbis diligentissime tractata fuerat in sexto Joannis. Satis ergo apparet quemadmodum nos ista conjungimus.' Petr. Mart. pp. 114, 115. Cp. Chamier, de Eucharist. lib. xi. c. 3, &c.

[c] Dean Fogg, in his excellent Compendium of Divinity, published A.D. 1712, has fully and distinctly expressed the sense of John vi. in two lines:

'Christus ibi loquitur, non de manducatione sacramentali, sed spirituali, et de pane significato, non signifi-

A late very judicious Prelate of our Church, in a sermon on John vi. 53, has well expressed the sense of our Church in this matter, in the words here following: 'The body and blood of Christ are to be understood in such a sense as a soul can be supposed to feed upon a body, or to receive strength and nourishment by feeding upon it. But now the body of Christ can be no otherwise as food for the strengthening and refreshing our souls, than only as the spiritual benefits of that body and blood, that is to say, the virtue and effects of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross are communicated to it; nor is the soul capable of receiving those benefits otherwise than by faith. So that the body and blood of Christ, in the sense of our Church, are only the benefits of Christ's passion; that is to say, the pardon of sin, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, and a nearer union with Christ: and our eating and drinking of that body and blood, is our being partakers of those benefits; and the mouth whereby we thus eat and drink, that is, the means whereby we are made partakers of those benefits, is our true and lively faith[d].' This account is formed upon our Cate chism, and upon the old principles of our first Reformers, and the next succeeding Divines, before any refined speculations came in to obscure or perplex a plain notion, and a very important truth. All I have to observe further upon it, by way of explanation, is as follows: 1. When the learned author says, that 'the soul is not capable of receiving those benefits otherwise than by faith,' I understand it of adult Christians, and of what they are ordinarily capable of: God may extraordinarily apply the benefits of Christ's passion wherever there is no moral obstacle, as he pleases. And it should be noted, that, properly speaking, we do not apply those benefits to ourselves, we only receive, or (by the help of God's grace) qualify ourselves for receiving: it is God that applies[e], as it is also God that justifies;

cante.' Fogg. Theolog. Specul. Schema, p. 309.

Dr. Wall says: 'The words of our Saviour to the Jews, John vi. 53, do no way appear to belong to the sacramental eating, which was not then instituted.' Wall, Inf. Bapt. part ii. c. 9. p. 448, 3rd ed.

[d] Archbishop Sharp, vol. vii. serm. xv. p. 366.

[e] 'Fides magis proprie dicitur accipere et apprehendere, quam vel

and he does it ordinarily in and by the sacraments to persons fitly prepared. 2. When it is said, that the body and blood of Christ, in the sense of our Church, are only the benefits of Christ's passion, I so understand it, as not to exclude all reference to our Lord's glorified body now in heaven, with which we maintain a mystical union, and which is itself one of the benefits consequent upon our partaking of Christ's passion; as seems to be intimated by the author himself, where he reckons a nearer union with Christ among the benefits. 3. The judicious author rightly makes faith to be the mouth only, by which we receive, not the meat or drink which we do receive; the means only of spiritual nutriment, not the nutriment itself: for the nutriment itself is pardon and grace coming down from above, flowing from the spiritual and gracious presence of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whose temple we are, while we are living members of Christ.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning Sacramental or Symbolical Feeding in the Eucharist.

AFTER considering spiritual manducation by itself, independent of any particular modes, forms, or circumstances, it will next be proper to take a view of it, as set forth in a sensible way, with the additional garniture of signs and symbols. Under the Old Testament, besides the ordinary sacrifices, the manna and the waters of the rock were signs and symbols of spiritual manducation, according to St. Paul's doctrine, where he teaches, that the ancient Israelites 'did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink[f]' which Christians do; the same with ours as to the spiritual signification of it: so I understand the place, with many judicious interpreters, both

polliceri, vel praestare. Sed verbum Dei et promissio cui fides innititur, non vero fides hominum, praesentia reddit quae promittit; quemadmodum inter reformatos et pontificios aliquot consensum est in Collatione Sangermani habita 1561. Male enim a multis Romanensibus nobis objicitur, quasi crederemus hanc Christi praesentiam et communicationem in sacramento, per nudam fidem tantum effici.' Cosin. Histor. Transubst. c. ii. sect. 8. pp. 17, 18.

[f] 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

ancients[g] and moderns[h]. As the heavenly meat and drink of the true Israelites was Christ, according to the Apostle, and Christ also is ours, the Apostle must be understood to teach that they fed upon the same heavenly food that we do; only by different symbols, and in a fainter light. The symbols are there called spiritual meat and drink, that is, mystical; for they signified the true food, which none but the true Israelites were fed with, while all received the signs. In the New Testament, the bread and wine of the Eucharist are the appointed symbols of the spiritual blessings, but under clearer and brighter manifestations. For proof hereof we must look back to the original institution of the Sacrament, and particularly to the words, 'This is my body,' &c., and 'This is my blood,' &c. To undertake the exposition of them is entering into the most perplexed and intricate part of the whole subject; made so by an odd series of incidents, in a long tract of time, and remaining as a standing monument of human infirmities: in consideration whereof, moderns, of all parties, may perhaps see reason not to bear themselves high above the ancients, in point of wisdom or sagacity. The plain obvious notion, which nobody almost could miss of for six or seven centuries, came at length to be obscured in dark ages, and by degrees to be almost totally lost. It was no very easy matter to recover it afterwards, or to clear off the mists at once. Contentions arose, even among the elucidators: and what was worst of all, after that in every scheme proposed, at the Reformation, some difficulties remained, which could not of a sudden be perfectly adjusted, there appeared at length some enterprising persons, who, either for shortening disputes, or for other causes, laboured to depreciate the Sacraments themselves, as if they were scarce worth the contending for: which was pushing matters to the most dangerous and pernicious extreme that could be invented. But I pass on.

For the clearer apprehending what that plain and easy notion

[g] Austin, Bede, Bertram, and others.

[h] Besides commentators, see Archbishop Cranmer on the Sacrament, p. 86, &c. Bishop Jewel, Treatise on the Sacrament. Mede, Discourse xliii. p. 325, &c. Bishop Moreton on the Sacrament, book v. c. 2. sect. 3. p. 314.

was, which I just now spake of, I choose to begin with a famous passage of St. Bernard, often quoted in this subject, and very useful to give the readers a good general idea of the symbolical nature of the Sacraments. He compares them with instruments of investiture, (into lands, honours, dignities,) which are significant and emblematical of what they belong to, and are at the same time means of conveyance[i]. A book, a ring, a crosier, and the like, have often been made use of as instruments for such purpose. They are not without their significancy in the way of instructive emblem: but what is most considerable, they are instruments to convey those rights, privileges, honours, offices, possessions, which in silent language they point to. Those small gifts or pledges are as nothing in themselves, but they are highly valuable with respect to what they are pledges of, and what they legally and effectively convey: so it is with the signs and symbols of both Sacraments, and particularly with the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist. They are, after consecration, called by the names of what they are pledges of, and are ordained to convey; because they are, though not literally, yet in just construction and certain effect, (standing on Divine promise and Divine acceptance,) the very things which they are called, viz. the body and blood of Christ to all worthy receivers. In themselves they are bread and wine from first to last: but while they are made use of in the holy service, they are considered, construed, understood, (pursuant to Divine law, promise, covenant,) as standing for what they represent and exhibit. Thus, frequently, in human affairs, things or persons are considered very differently from what they really are in themselves, by a kind of construction of law: and they are supposed to be, to all intents and purposes, and in full legal effect, what they are presumed to serve for, and to supply the place of.

A deed of conveyance, or any like instrument under hand and seal, is not a real estate, but it conveys one; and it is in effect

[i] 'Variae sunt investiturae secundum ea quibus investimur: verbi gratia, investitur canonicus per librum, abbas per baculum et annulum simul: sicut, inquam, in ejusmodi rebus est, sic et divisiones gratiarum diversis sunt traditae sacramentis.' Bernard. de Coen. Domini, serm. i. p. 145.

the estate itself, as the estate goes along with it; and as the right, title, and property (which are real acquirements) are, as it were, bound up in it, and subsist by it[k]. If any person should seriously object, in such a case, that he sees nothing but wax and parchments, and that he does not apprehend how they can be of any extraordinary value to him, or how he is made richer by them; he might be pitied, I presume, for his unthinking ignorance or simplicity: but if, in a contrary extreme, he should be credulous enough to imagine, that the parchments themselves are really and literally the estate, are so many houses or tenements, or acres of glebe, inclosed in his cabinet, he could not well be presumed to be far short of distraction. I leave it to the intelligent reader, to make the application proper to the present subject. I have supposed, all the while, that the cases are so far parallel: but whether they really are so must now be the point of inquiry; for I am sensible that the thing is too important to be taken for granted.

Come we then directly to consider the words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.' What can they, or what do they mean?

1. They cannot mean, that this bread and this wine are really and literally that body in the same broken state as it hung upon the cross, and that blood which was spilled upon the ground 1700 years ago. Neither yet can they mean that this bread and wine literally and properly are our Lord's glorified body, which is as far distant from us, as heaven is distant: all sense, all reason, all Scripture, all antiquity, and sound theology, reclaim against so wild a thought.

2. Well then, since the words cannot be understood literally, or with utmost rigour, they must be brought under some figure

[k] Our very judicious Hooker has explained this matter much the same way, in these words, as spoken by our Lord:

'This hallowed food, through the concurrence of Divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need: this is to them my body.' Hooker, vol. ii. p. 337. Cp. Cosin. Histor. Transubst. pp. 57, 58.

or other, some softening explication, to make them both sense and truth.

3. But there may be danger of undercommenting, as well as of interpreting too high: and men may recede so far from the letter as altogether to dilute the meaning, or break its force. As nothing but necessity can warrant us in going from the letter at all, we ought not to go further than such necessity requires. There appears to be something very solemn and awful in our Lord's pointed words, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.' Had he intended no more than a bare commemoration, or representation, it might have been sufficient to have said, Eat this bread broken, and drink this wine poured out, in remembrance of me and my passion, without declaring in that strong manner that the bread and wine are his body and blood, at the same time commanding his Disciples to take them as such. We ought to look out for some as high and significant a meaning as the nature of the thing can admit of, in order to answer such emphatical words and gestures.

4. Some, receding from the letter, have supposed the words to mean, this bread and this wine are my body and blood in power and effect, or in virtue and energy: which is not much amiss, excepting that it seems to carry in it some obscure conception either of an inherent or infused virtue resting upon the bare elements, and operating as a mean, which is not the truth of the case; excepting also, that it leaves us but a very dark and confused idea of what the Lord's body or blood means, in that way of speaking, whether natural or sacramental, or both in one.

5. It appears more reasonable and more proper to say, that the bread and wine are the body and blood (viz. the natural body and blood) in just construction, put upon them by the lawgiver himself, who has so appointed, and who is able to make it good. The symbols are not the body in power and effect, if those words mean efficiency: but, suitable dispositions supposed in the recipient, the delivery of these symbols is, in construction of Gospel law, and in Divine intention, and therefore in certain effect or consequence, a delivery of the things signified. If God

hath been pleased so to order that these outward elements, in the due use of the Eucharist, shall be imputed to us, and accepted by him, as pledges of the natural body of our Lord, and that this constructional intermingling his body and blood with ours, shall be the same thing in effect with our adhering inseparably to him, as members or parcels of him; then those outward symbols are, though not literally, yet interpretatively, and to all saving purposes, that very body and blood which they so represent with effect: they are appointed instead of them[1].

This notion of the Sacrament, as it is both intelligible and reasonable, so is it likewise entirely consonant to Scripture language; considered first in the general; next, with respect to the Jewish sacrifices and sacraments; then with regard also to Christian Baptism; and lastly, with respect to what is elsewhere taught of the Eucharist. Further, it appears to have been the ancient notion of all the Christian churches for six centuries or more; and was scarce so much as obscured, till very corrupt and ignorant ages came up; and was never totally lost, though almost swallowed up for a time by the prevailing growth of transubstantiation. These particulars I shall now endeavour to prove distinctly, in the same order as I have named them.

1. I undertake to shew that the interpretation here given is favoured by the general style or phraseology of Scripture; which abounds with examples of such figurative and constructional expressions, where one thing is mentioned and another understood, according to the way which I have before intimated. I do not here refer to such instances as are often produced in this subject; as metaphorical locutions, when our Lord is styled a door, a vine, a star, a sun, a rock, a lamb, a lion, or the like; which amount only to so many similitudes couched, every one respectively, under a single word. Neither do I point to other well known instances, of seven kine being seven years, and four great beasts being four kings, and the field being the world, reapers being angels, and the like: which appertain only to visional or parabolical representations, and come not up to the point in hand.

[1] Τὸ *ποτήριον ἐν τάξει αἵματος ἠγεῖσθαι* is the phrase of Victor Antiochenus, who wrote about A.D. 401. Vid. Albertin. p. 832.

The examples which we are to seek for, as similar and parallel to the expressions made use of by our Lord in the institution, must be those wherein some real thing is in just construction and certain effect allowed to be another thing.

Moses was a God to Pharaoh [m], not literally, but in effect. The walking tabernacle, or moving ark, being a symbol of the Divine presence, was considered as God walking [n] among his people. Faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness [o], or sinless perfection; not that it strictly or literally was so, but it was so accepted in God's account. John the Baptist was Elias [p], not literally, but in just construction. Man and wife are one flesh [q], not in the utmost strictness of speech, but interpretatively, or in effect; they are considered as one. He that is joined to an harlot is one body [r], not literally, but in construction of Divine law: and he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit [s], is considered as so, and with real effect. The Church is our Lord's body [t], interpretatively so. Levi paid tithes in Abraham, not literally, but constructionally, or as one may say [u]. Abraham received his son Isaac from the dead, not really, but in just construction, and in a figure [x]. The Apostle tells his new converts, 'Ye are our epistle,' and the 'epistle of Christ [y];' that is to say, instead of an epistle, or equivalent thereto, the same thing in effect or use. These examples may suffice to shew, in the general, that Scripture is no stranger to the symbolical or constructional language, expressing one thing by another thing, considered as equivalent thereto, and amounting to the same as to real effects or purposes.

2. This will appear still plainer from the sacrificial language and usage in the Old Testament. Blood, in sacrificial language, was the life of an animal: and the shedding the blood for sacrifice, together with the sprinkling it, were understood to be giving

[m] Exod. vii. 1.
[n] Levit. xxvi. 11, 12. Deut. xxiii. 14.
[o] Gen. xv. 6. Rom. iv. 3, 9, 22. Gal. iii. 6.
[p] Matt. xvii. 12. Mark ix. 13.
[q] 1 Cor. vi. 16.
(Matt. xix. 5).
[r] 1 Cor. vi. 16.
[s] Ibid. 17.
[t] Ephes. i. 23. See Spinkes against Transubst. pp. 29, 30.
[u] Hebr. vii. 9.
[x] Hebr. xi. 19.
[y] 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3.

life for life[z]. The fumes of some sacrifices were considered as sweet odours[a], grateful to God when sent up with a pure mind. The altar was considered as God's table[b]: and what was offered upon it, and consumed by fire, was construed and accepted as God's meat, bread, food, portion, or mess[c]. Not that it was literally so, but it was all one to the supplicants; with whom God dealt as kindly, as if it had really been so: it was the same thing in legal account, was symbolically the same, and therefore so named. The laying hands upon the head of the victim was, in construction of Divine law, transferring the legal offences upon the victim[d]: more particularly, the people's performing that ceremony towards the scape-goat was considered as laying their iniquities upon him, which accordingly the goat was supposed to bear away with him[e]; all which was true in legal account. The priests, in eating the sin offering of the people, were considered as eating up their guilt, incorporating it with themselves, and discharging the people of it[f]: and the effect answered. But when the people feasted on the peace offerings, it was symbolically eating peace, and maintaining amity with God: to which St. Paul alludes in a noted passage[g], to be explained hereafter. From hence it may be observed, by the way, that symbolical phrases and symbolical services were what the Jews had been much and long used to, before our Lord's time: which may be one reason why the Apostles shewed no surprise at what was said to them in the institution of the Eucharist, nor called for any explanation.

From the Jewish sacrifices, we may pass on to their sacraments, which, taking the word in a large sense, were many, but in the stricter sense were but two, namely, Circumcision and the Passover. With respect to those also, the like figurative and symbolical language prevailed. We find St. Paul declaring of the manna and of the waters of old, that they were spiritual

[z] Gen. ix. 4. Levit. xvii. 10, 11.
[a] Gen. viii. 21. Exod. xxix. 18, et passim.
[b] Ezek. xli. 22; xliv. 16. Mal. i. 7, 12.
[c] Levit. iii. 11; xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22. Numb. xxviii. 2, 24. Ezek. xliv. 7.
[d] Levit. i. 4; viii. 14, 15.
[e] Levit. xvi. 21, 22.
[f] Levit. x. 17. Hos. iv. 8.
[g] 1 Cor. x. 18. Compare Levit. vii. 18, and Ainsworth in loc.

food; and accordingly he does not scruple, while speaking of the rock from whence the waters flowed, to say that 'that rock was Christ[h].' It typified Christ: yea and more than so, the waters which it yielded, typified the blood and water which should afterwards flow from our Lord's side, and were to the faithful of that time spiritual pledges of the benefits of Christ's passion, like as the sacramental wine is now[i]. This consideration fully accounts for the strong expression which the Apostle in that case made use of, 'that rock was Christ:' it was so in effect to every true Israelite of that time.

Circumcision of the flesh was a symbolical rite, betokening the true circumcision of the heart; which was the condition of the covenant between God and his people, on their part[k], and God's acceptance of the same on his part[l], to all saving purposes: therefore circumcision had the name of covenant, and the sign was called what it literally was not, but what it really and truly signified, and to the faithful exhibited[m].

The like may be observed of the Passover, which was feasting upon a lamb, but was called the Lord's Passover, as looking backwards, plainly, to the angel's passing over the Hebrews, so as to preserve them from the plague[n] then inflicted on the Egyptians, and mystically looking forwards to God's passing over the sins of mankind, for the sake of Christ the true paschal lamb[o]. Such is the customary language of Scripture in those cases, denominating the signs by the things signified, and at the same time exhibited in a qualified sense.

3. I proceed to the consideration of Baptism, a sacrament of the New Testament; a symbolical rite, full of figure and mystery; representing divers graces, blessings, privileges, and exhibiting the same in the very act: for which reason the Scripture language concerning it is very strong and emphatical, like to what our Lord made use of with respect to the Eucharist. St. Paul does not barely intimate that we ought to be buried with Christ in Baptism, or that we signify his burial, but he says

[h] 1 Cor. x. 4.
[i] See above, p. 129.
[k] Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6. Levit. xxvi. 41. Jerem. iv. 4. Rom. ii. 28, 29.
[l] Gen. xvii. 7.
[m] Gen. xvii. 10, 13, 14.
[n] Exod. xii. 11, 12, 13.
[o] 1 Cor. v. 7.

plainly, 'we are buried;' and likewise that 'we have been planted together in the likeness of his death,' and that 'our old man is crucified,' and that we are 'freed from sin,' and 'dead with Christ[p].' The reason is, because the things there mentioned are not merely represented, but effectuated always on God's part, if there be no failure or obstacle on ours. The spiritual graces of Baptism go along with the ceremony, in the due use of it, and are supposed by the Apostle to be conveyed at that instant. 1. Actual remission of sins[q]. 2. Present sanctification of the Spirit[r]. 3. Actual communion with Christ's body, with Christ our head[s]. 4. A certain title, for the time being, to resurrection and salvation[t]. 5. A putting on Christ[u]. I take the more notice here of the last article of putting on Christ, as being of near affinity with feeding upon Christ in the other sacrament. Both of them express a near conjunction and close intimacy: but the latter is the stronger figure, and the more affecting emblem. Christ is, in a qualified sense, our clothing, and our food; our baptismal garment, and our eucharistical banquet: but what enters within us, and is diffused all over us, and becomes incorporate with us, being considered as a symbol of Christ, expresses the most intimate union and coalition imaginable. Probably this symbol was made choice of for the Eucharist, as it is the top perfection of Christian worship or service. Baptism is for babes in Christ, this for grown men: Baptism initiates, while the Eucharist perfects: Baptism begins the spiritual life, the Eucharist carries on and finishes it. And therefore it is that the Eucharist has so frequently been called τὸ

[p] Rom. vi. 4, 6, 7, 8. 'De ipso baptismo Apostolus, Consepulti, inquit, sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem. Non ait sepulturam significavimus, sed prorsus ait, consepulti sumus: sacramentum ergo tantae rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.' August. Ep. 98. ad Bonifac. p. 268. ed. Bened.

[q] Acts xxii. 16; ii. 38. Coloss. ii. 13. 1 Cor. vi. 11.

[r] John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38. 1 Cor. xii. 13; vi. 11. Ephes. v. 26. Tit. iii. 5. Heb. x. 22.

[s] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[t] Rom. vi. 8, 9. Tit. iii. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 21. Coloss. ii. 11, 12, 13. Add 1 Cor. xv. 29. For so I understand 'baptizing for the dead;' in order to have our dead bodies raised. Vid. Chrysost. in 1 Cor. x. Hom. xxiii. p. 389; et in 1 Cor. xv. 29. Hom. xl. p. 513. ed. Sav. Isidor. Pelus. Epist. lib. i. Ep. 221. Theodorit. in 1 Cor. xv. 29.

[u] Gal. iii. 27. Cp. Wolfius in loc. Deylingius, Obs. Sacr. tom. iii. p. 330.

τέλειον[x], the perfecting service, and the Sacrament of sacraments[y]; or emphatically the Sacrament, which obtains at this day. I may add that, though Baptism represents the burial and the resurrection of our Lord, and entitles us to a partnership in both, yet there is something still more awful and venerable in representing (not merely his acts or offices, but) his very Person, in part, which is done in the Eucharist, by the symbols of bread and wine, representing his body and blood.

From what hath been said under this last article concerning Baptism, we may observe, that it is not literally going into the grave with Christ, neither is it literally rising from the dead with him; but it is so interpretatively and in certain effect, proper dispositions supposed on our part: and it is not barely a representation of a thing, but a real exhibition. So likewise in the Eucharist: the elements are not literally what they are called, but they are interpretatively and in effect the same thing with what they stand for. Such appears to be the true account of the symbolical phrases of the institution.

4. To this agrees what we meet with further in St. Paul's account of this Sacrament. It is the Communion of the body and blood of Christ[z]. Which expresses communication on the part of the donor, and participation on the side of the receiver. There is communication from God, and a participation by us, of Christ's crucified body directly, and of the body glorified consequentially. Yet this grant and this reception of our Lord's body are not to be understood with utmost rigour, but after the manner of symbolical grants and conveyances; where the symbols are construed to be, in real and beneficial effect, what they supply the place of. But of this text I may have occasion to say more in a distinct chapter, and so may dismiss it for the present.

[x] Vid. Casaub. Exercit. xvi. n. 48. p. 411, alias 572. Suicer. Thesaur. tom. ii. p. 1259.

'Conjunctioni nostrae cum Christo, cujus instrumenta sunt verbum Dei et sacramenta, veluti colophonem imponit participatio corporis et sanguinis Christi in coena Dominica: nullus enim restat alius modus, quo in terris versantes arctius cum Christo, capite nostro, conjungamur.' Casaub. ibid.

[y] Τελετῶν τελετή. Pseudo-Dionys. cap. iii. p. 282. [z] 1 Cor. x. 16.

St. Paul, in the same Epistle, speaks of the unworthy receiver, as 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' and as 'eating and drinking damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body[a]:' all which is easily and naturally accounted for, upon the principles before mentioned. Our Lord's body is interpretatively delivered, with all the emoluments thereunto pertaining, to as many as receive worthily: the same body is interpretatively offered[b] to as many as receive, though ever so unworthily. The unworthy receiver, through his own fault, disqualifies himself from partaking of what is offered, namely, from partaking of the things signified: which being our Lord's own body and blood, he is therefore guilty, not only of profaning holy things, (as even the symbols themselves, when consecrated, are holy,) but also of slighting and contemning our Lord's own body and blood, which had been symbolically offered to him[c]. He incurs the just judgment of God, for not discerning, that is, not esteeming, not reverencing, not receiving[d] the Lord's body when he might, and when both duty and interest required his most grateful and most devout acceptance. Nay further, he is guilty of contemning the blood of the covenant, and the author of our salvation, by so profane an use of what so nearly concerns both. This must

[a] 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.

[b] 'Credentibus fit corpus vivificum, quia illi panis caelestis et corporis Christi vere sunt participes: aliis vere tam non recipientibus quam non credentibus licet antitypon sit, tamen illis nequaquam est, nec fit corpus Christi.' Cosin. Histor. Eccl. p. 69.

[c] 'Non idcirco vocat Paulus reos quod ipsum corpus Christi ederint, neque idcirco illi judicium sibi arcessunt quod sumpserint, sed quod sumere corpus Domini neglexerint.' Lamb. Danaeus Apolog. pro Helvet. Eccl. p. 30, alias 1479.

N. B. This account is right as to fact, that the unworthy do not receive the Body, but as to guilt in approaching the holy table, it is insufficient; because, by this account, there would be no difference between absenting, and unworthy receiving; both being equally a neglect of the same thing. There must be more in unworthy reception: it is not merely neglecting the inward grace, but it is profaning also the outward means.

[d] The wicked receive the signs of the Lord's body and blood, not the body and blood; that is, not the thing signified. So the Fathers distinguish commonly on this head. The testimonies of Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, Austin, and others, may be seen collected and explained in Albertinus, pp. 549, 586. Sometimes the Fathers do indeed speak less accurately, of the unworthy receiving the body and blood, meaning the outward symbols, giving the name of the thing signified to the signs, by a metonymy. Compare Moreton, p. 320.

be so, in the very nature of the thing, if we suppose (as we here do) that the sacramental symbols are interpretatively, or in just construction, by Divine appointment, the body and blood of Christ. But this point also must be more minutely considered in its proper place.

5. I proceed, in the last place, to examine the sentiments of the ancients on this head: and if they fall in with the account here given, we can then want nothing to set this matter in the clearest light, or to fix it beyond all reasonable dispute.

A. D. 107. *Ignatius.*

Ignatius, occasionally reflecting on some persons who rejected the use of the Eucharist, delivers his mind as here follows: 'They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they admit not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised from the dead: they therefore thus gainsaying the gift of God, die in their disputes[e].' It is to be noted, that those misbelievers (probably the old visionaries, in Greek Docetae) did not allow that our Lord had any real flesh or blood, conceiving that his birth, passion, and resurrection were all imaginary, were mere show and appearance. Thereupon they rejected the Eucharist and the prayers thereto belonging, as founded in the doctrine of our Lord's real humanity. Now, Ignatius here intimates that the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist are, in just construction, the body, or flesh and blood of Christ as dying, and as raised again: therefore he bore about him a real body. The Eucharist being representative, and also interpretatively exhibitive of such real flesh and blood, was itself a standing memorial of the truth of the Church's doctrine concerning our Lord's real humanity. Ignatius could not imagine that the symbols were literally flesh and blood; no one was then weak enough to entertain so wild a thought: but if they

[e] Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν· οἱ οὖν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, συζητοῦντες ἀποθνήσκουσι. Ignat. ad Smyrn. cap. 7. Vid. Albertin. p. 286, &c.

were constructionally or interpretatively so, it was sufficient, being all that his argument required. The Eucharist, so understood, supposed a real body of flesh and blood belonging to our blessed Lord, both as dying and rising again: for, without that supposition, the Eucharist was no Eucharist at all, a representation of nothing, or a false representation[f]; and that the misbelievers themselves were very sensible of, and therefore abstained from it. I may further observe, that Ignatius here supposes not, with the consubstantiators, a natural body of Christ locally present, and a sacramental one besides; but it is all one symbolical body in the Eucharist, supplying the place of the natural, in real effect, and to all saving purposes. The Eucharist, that is, the bread and wine, is (constructionally) the flesh of Jesus, &c. It is not said, that it is with the flesh, or that one is in, with, or under the other: so that Mr. Pfaffius had no occasion to triumph here[g].

That Ignatius admitted of real and beneficial effects will be plain from another passage: 'Breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, a preservative that we should not die, but should live for ever in Jesus Christ[h].' In what sense he understood the thing so to be, will appear more fully when we come to other Fathers, somewhat later in the same century. There is one place more of this apostolical writer worth the reciting:

[f] Chrysostom's reasoning, in like case, is here very apposite, in Matt. Hom. liii. p. 783. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνος σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα; 'If Jesus did not really die, what are the eucharistical elements symbols of?' N.B. The argument did not require or suppose a corporal presence: a symbolical one was sufficient to confute the gainsayers, if Chrysostom had any judgment. Cp. Pseud. Origen. Dialog. contr. Marcion, p. 853.

[g] Pfaffius (p. 263) appears to triumph over Albertinus, with respect to this passage of Ignatius: but Albertinus had very justly explained it, and defended his explication with great learning and solid judgment, beyond all reasonable dispute; as every impartial reader will find, who will but be at the pains to look into him, p. 286, &c.

[h] Ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅς ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός. Ignat. ad Ephes. cap. 20. This was no flight, but the standing doctrine of the author, which he expresses without any figure elsewhere. Epist. ad Smyrn. cap. 7: συνέφερεν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾶν, ἵνα καὶ ἀναζῶσιν. 'It behoves them to celebrate the feast of the Eucharist, (so I understand ἀγαπᾶν, with Cotelerius in loc.), that they may rise to life.'

'The flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ is but one, and the cup one unto the unity of his blood[i].' He alluded, probably, to 1 Cor. x. 16, 'communion of the blood of Christ,' and so the meaning is, for the uniting us to Christ, first, and then, in and through him, to one another, his one blood being the cement which binds head and members all together.

A. D. 140. *Justin Martyr.*

Justin, another early Christian teacher and martyr, comes next: I shall cite as much from him as may suffice to clear the point in hand. 'This food we call the Eucharist: which no one is allowed to partake of, but he that believes our doctrines to be true, and who has been baptized in the laver of regeneration for remission of sins, and lives up to what Christ has taught. For we take not these as common bread and common drink: but like as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being incarnate by the Word of God, bore about him both flesh and blood for our salvation; so are we taught that this food which is blessed by the prayer of the Word that came from him [God], and which is changed into the nourishment of our flesh and blood, is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles in their commentaries, called the Gospels, have left it upon record, that Jesus so commanded them; for he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he said, Do this in remembrance of me; this is my body: in like manner also he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, This is my blood[k].' Upon this passage of Justin may be observed as follows: 1. That he supposed the elements to be blessed or sanctified by virtue of the prayer of the Word or Logos, first made use of in the institution, and remaining in force to this day, in such a sense as I have explained above, in the chapter of Consecration. 2. That Justin also supposed the same elements, after consecration, to continue still bread and wine, only not common bread and wine: for while he says,

[i] Μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. Ignat. ad Philad. cap. 4.

[k] Justin Martyr. Apol. i. pp. 96, 97. ed. Lond. See also above, chap. iii. p. 503, where part of the same passage is cited for another purpose.

it is not *common* bread, he supposes it to be bread. 3. That while he supposes the consecrated elements to be changed into our bodily nutriment, he could not have a thought of our Lord's natural body's admitting such a change. 4. That nevertheless he does maintain that such consecrated food is, in some sense or other, the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus; and he quotes the words of the institution to prove it. 5. He supposes no other flesh and blood locally present in the Eucharist, but that very consecrated food which he speaks of; for that is the flesh and blood. Therefore he affords no colour for imagining two bodies, natural and sacramental, as locally present together, in the way of consubstantiation. 6. It remains then, that he could mean nothing else but the representative or symbolical body of Christ, answering to the natural, (once upon the cross, and now in heaven,) as proxies answer to their principals, as authentic copies or exemplifications to their originals, in use, value, and legal effect. For, that Justin cannot be understood of a bare figure, or naked representation, appears from hence, that it supposes a Divine power, the power of the Logos himself, (which implies his spiritual presence,) to be necessary for making the elements become such symbolical flesh and blood: whereas, if it were only a figure, or representation, men might easily make it themselves by their own power, and would need only the original commission to warrant their doing it. 7. Though Justin (addressing himself to Jews or Pagans) does not speak so plainly of the great Christian privileges or graces conferred in the Eucharist, as Ignatius, writing to Christians, before him did, yet he has tacitly insinuated the same things; as well by mentioning the previous qualifications requisite for it, as also by observing that the [symbolical] flesh and blood of Christ are incorporate with ours: from whence by just inference all the rest follows, as every grace is implied in such our interpretative union with Christ crucified or glorified. Besides that our author supposed, as I before noted, a real spiritual presence of the Divine nature of our Lord in or with the elements, to make them effectually the body and blood of Christ: and he carries it so high, as to draw a comparison from the presence of the Logos to our Lord's

humanity, whereof the Eucharist is a kind of emblem, though in a loose general way, faint and imperfect[1]. Thus much however is common to both: that there is a presence of the Logos with something corporeal; a presence with something considered as his body; and a presence operating in conjunction with that body for the uniting all his true members together under him their head. But that such comparisons help to clear the subject is more than I will say; being sensible that they are far from exact, and may want distinctions to make them bear, or otherwise may be apt to mislead: it is enough, if we can but come at the true and full sense of the authors.

A.D. 176. *Irenaeus.*

Irenaeus's doctrine of the Eucharist, so far as concerns this present chapter, may be understood from the passages here following, together with some explanatory remarks which I mean to add to them.

'How can they say that the flesh goes to corruption, and never more partakes of life, when it is fed with the body of our Lord, and with his blood? . . As the terrestrial bread upon receiving the invocation of God is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, terrestrial and celestial; so also our bodies, upon receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having an assurance of a resurrection to all eternity[m].' 'But if this flesh of ours has no title to salvation, then neither did our Lord redeem us with his own blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion [communication] of his blood, nor the bread which we break the communion [communication] of his body. For it is not blood, if it is not of the veins and flesh, and what-

[1] See the Doctrinal Use of the Sacraments considered, vol. v. p. 114.

[m] Πῶς τὴν σάρκα λέγουσιν εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην; . . . . ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος ἔκκλησιν [forte ἐπίκλησιν] τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἔτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251. ed. Bened.

ever else makes up the substance of the human frame, such as the Word was really made [n].' A little after, the author adds this large explanatory passage, worth the noting: 'The creature of the cup he declared to be his own blood, with which he imbues our blood; and the creature of bread he affirmed to be his own body, out of which our bodies grow up. When therefore the mingled cup and the created bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist becomes Christ's body, and by these the substance of our flesh grows and consists, how can they say, that the flesh is not capable of the gift of God, (namely, life eternal,) when it is fed with the body and blood of Christ, and is member of him? To this purpose speaks St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, that we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones, Ephes. v. 30. . . . The flesh is nourished by the cup which is his blood, and is increased by the bread which is his body. And like as a branch of the vine put into the ground brings forth fruit in its season, and a grain of wheat falling into the ground and there dissolved, riseth again with manifest increase, by the Spirit of God that containeth all things; and those afterwards by Divine wisdom serve for the use of man, and receiving the Logos [Word] of God, become the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ: so also our bodies being fed by it, [viz. the Eucharist,] and laid in the ground, and dissolving there, shall yet arise in their season, by means of the Divine Logos vouchsafing them a resurrection to the glory of God the Father [o].'

From these several passages thus laid together, I take the liberty to observe: 1. That our author had no notion of the elements being changed, upon consecration, into the natural body of Christ; for he supposes them still to remain as the earthly part, and to be converted into bodily nutriment; which to affirm of our Lord's body, crucified or glorified, would be infinitely

[n] 'Si autem non salvetur haec [caro], videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus communicatio corporis ejus est. Sanguis enim non est nisi a venis et carnibus, et a reliqua quae secundum hominem est substantia, qua vere factum est Verbum Dei.' Iren. lib. v. cap. 2. p. 293.

[o] Iren lib. v. p. 294.

absurd [p]. 2. Neither does our author at all favour the notion of Christ's natural body being literally and locally present under or with the elements: for the heavenly thing supposed to supervene [q] in the consecration, and to be present, is not Christ's natural body, but the Logos, or Divine nature of our Lord, or the Holy Spirit. Or if he did suppose the heavenly thing to be Christ's glorified body, yet even that amounts to no more than saying that our mystical union with his body is made or strengthened in the Eucharist; not by any local presence of that body, but as our mystical union with all the true members is therein perfected, at whatever distance they are: so that whether we interpret the heavenly part of the Logos, or of the body of Christ, Irenaeus will not be found to favour the Lutheran notion of the presence. 3. But least of all does he favour the figurists or memorialists; for his doctrine runs directly counter to them almost in every line. He asserts over and over, that Christ's body and blood are eaten and drank in the Eucharist, and our bodies thereby fed; and not only so, but insured thereby for a happy resurrection: and the reason he gives is, that our bodies are thereby made or continued members of Christ's body, flesh, and bones: and his conclusion is built on this principle, that members follow the head, or that the parts go with the whole: which reasoning supposes that the sacred symbols, though not literally, are yet interpretatively, or constructionally, the body and blood [r]. 4. To make the symbols

[p] Compare a fragment of Irenaeus, p. 343, concerning Blandina; from which it is manifest that the Christians despised the Pagans for imagining that Christ's body and blood were supposed to be literally eaten in the Eucharist: they rejected the thought with abhorrence.

[q] In like manner, Nazianzen makes Baptism to consist of two things, water and the Spirit; which answers to Irenaeus's earthly and heavenly parts in the Eucharist. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xi. p. 641.

[r] N.B. The Lutherans know not how to allow, in their way, that our bodies are so fed with the Lord's body, which they suppose to be locally present; or that any feeding is a pledge of a happy resurrection, since they suppose the feeding common both to good and bad. Hence it is, that they can make no sense of Irenaeus's argument. See Pfaffius, pp. 72, 73, 84, 85, 104. Deylingius, Observ. Miscellan. pp. 75, 76. They might perceive, if they pleased, from this plain mark, that their scheme has a flaw in it, and cannot stand. The mistake is owing to the want of considering the nature of symbolical language and symbolical grants. Our bodies are not literally, but symbolically fed with our Lord's body;

answer in such a view, he supposes the concurrence of a Divine power to secure the effect, a spiritual presence of the Logos. 5. One thing only I conceive our author to be inaccurate in, (though perhaps more in expression than real meaning,) in superinducing the Logos upon the symbols themselves, rather than upon the recipients, which would have been better. But in a popular way of speaking, and with respect to the main thing, they may amount to the same: and it was not needful to distinguish critically about a mode of speech, while there was no suspicion of wrong notions being grafted upon it, as hath since happened. 6. Lastly, I may note that these larger passages of Irenaeus may serve as good comments upon the shorter ones of Ignatius before cited: and so Ignatius may lend antiquity to Irenaeus's sentiments, while Irenaeus's add light and strength to his.

A.D. 192. *Clemens of Alexandria.*

This Clemens was a person of infinite reading, and of great reputation in the Christian Church. His pieces are all of them learned, though not always so clear as might be wished. In a very full head, ideas are often crowded, and have not room to be distinctly ranged. Our author appears to have had elevated sentiments of the Christian Eucharist, but such as require close attention to see to the bottom of. He writes thus:

'The blood of the Lord is twofold, the carnal by which we are redeemed from corruption, and the spiritual by which we are anointed: to drink the blood of Jesus is to partake of our Lord's immortality. Moreover, the power of the Word is the Spirit, as blood is of the flesh. And correspondently, as wine is mingled with water, so is the Spirit with the man: and as the mingled cup goes for drink, so the Spirit leads to immortality. Again, the mixture of these two, viz. of the drink and

which in effect is tantamount: there lies the whole mystery of the matter; and thereupon hangs Irenaeus's argument. Good men are considered in that action as so fed; and it will be imputed to them, and accepted by God, as if it literally were so. Deylingius concludes, however it be, (that is, though he can make no consistent sense of his author,) yet Irenaeus is clear for real presence. Not at all in the Lutheran or the Popish sense; but only so far as symbolical and effectual amount to real.

of the Logos together, is called the Eucharist, viz. glorious and excellent grace, whereof those who partake in faith are sanctified, both body and soul. The Father's appointment mystically tempers man, a Divine mixture, with the Spirit and the Logos: for, in very deed, the Spirit joins himself with the soul as sustained by him, and the Logos with the flesh, for which the Logos became flesh [s].' What I have to observe of these lines of Clemens may be comprised in the particulars here following:

1. The first thing to be taken notice of, is the twofold blood of Christ: by which Clemens understands the natural blood shed upon the cross, and the spiritual blood exhibited in the Eucharist, namely, spiritual graces, the unction of the Holy Spirit, and union with the Logos, together with what is consequent thereupon. As to parallel places of the Fathers, who speak of the anointing, in the Eucharist, with the blood of Christ through the Spirit, the reader may consult Mr. Aubertine [t]; or Bishop Fell in his notes upon Cyprian [u]. St. Jerome seems to have used the like distinction with Clemens between the natural and spiritual body and blood of Christ [x]. If we would take in all the several kinds of our Lord's body, or all the notions that have gone under that name, they amount to these four: 1. His natural body, considered first as mortal, and next as immortal. 2. His typical

[s] *Διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικὸν ᾧ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν, τουτέστιν ᾧ κεχρίσμεθα· καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστι πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας. Ἰσχὺς δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἷμα σαρκός. Ἀναλόγως τοίνυν κίρναται, ὁ μὲν οἶνος τῷ ὕδατι, τῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ πνεῦμα. Καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς πίστιν* [leg. *πόσιν*] *εὐωχεῖ, τὸ κρᾶμα· τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὁδήγει, τὸ πνεῦμα· ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὖθις κρᾶσις, ποτοῦ τε καὶ λόγου, εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπαινουμένη καὶ καλή· ἧς οἱ κατὰ πίστιν μεταλαμβάνοντες, ἁγιάζονται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν· τὸ θεῖον κρᾶμα, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τοῦ πατρικοῦ βουλήματος πνεύματι καὶ λόγῳ συγκίρναντος μυστικῶς· καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς μὲν τὸ πνεῦμα ᾠκείωται τῇ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φερομένῃ ψυχῇ· ἡ δὲ σὰρξ, τῷ λόγῳ· δι' ἣν ὁ λόγος γέγονε σάρξ.* Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. c. 2. pp. 177, 178. Compare Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 188.

[t] Albertinus de Eucharistia, p. 380.

[u] Cyprian. Ep. lxx. p. 190. Note that the words in that edition are, 'Eucharistia est unde baptizati unguntur, oleum in altari sanctificatum.' But in the Benedictine edition, p. 125, the latter part is corrected into 'oleo in altari sanctificato.'

[x] 'Dupliciter vero sanguis Christi et caro intelligitur: vel spiritualis illa atque divina, de qua ipse dixit Joan. vi. 54, 56; vel caro, et sanguis, quae crucifixa est, et qui militis effusus est lancea.' Hieron. in Eph. c. i. p. 328.

or symbolical body, viz. the outward sign in the Eucharist. 3. His spiritual body, in or out of the Eucharist, viz. the thing signified. 4. His mystical body, that is, his Church. But I proceed.

2. The next observation to be made upon Clemens is, that he manifestly excludes the natural body of Christ from being literally or locally present in the Sacrament, admitting only the spiritual; which he interprets of the Logos and of the Holy Spirit, one conceived more particularly to sanctify the body, and the other the soul, and both inhabiting the regenerate man. Which general doctrine, abstracting from the case of the Eucharist, is founded in express Scripture [y], and may by just and clear consequence be applied to the Eucharist, in virtue of the words of the institution, and of John vi. and other texts, besides the plain nature and reason of the thing.

3. Another thing to be observed of Clemens is, that as he plainly rejects any corporal and local presence, so does he as plainly reject the low notions of the figurists or memorialists: for no man ever expressed himself more strongly in favour of spiritual graces conveyed in the Eucharist.

4. It may be further noted, which shews our author's care and accuracy, that he brings not the Logos and Holy Spirit so much upon the elements, as upon the persons, viz. the worthy receivers, to sanctify them both in body and soul. He does indeed speak of the mixture of the wine and the Logos; and if he is to be understood of the personal, and not vocal, Word, he then supposes the Eucharist to consist of two things, earthly and heavenly, just as Irenaeus before him did: but even upon that supposition, he might really mean no more than that the communicant received both together, both at the same instant. They were only so far mixed, as being both administered at the same time, and to the same person, receiving the one with his mouth, and the other with his mind, strengthened at once both in body and in soul [z]. Clemens, in another place, cites part of the insti-

[y] John xiv. 16, 17, 23. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

[z] 'Signum signatumque conjunctim considerantur, tanquam unum aggregatum, idque ob conjunctam amborum exhibitionem et participationem

tution, by memory perhaps, as follows: 'He blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink; this is my blood. The blood of the grape mystically signifies the Word poured forth for many, for the remission of sins, that holy torrent of gladness [a].' Three things are observable from this passage: one, that the wine of the Eucharist, after consecration, is still the blood of the grape: another, that it is called the blood of Christ, or blood of the Logos, (as Origen also [b] styles it,) symbolically signifying and exhibiting the fruits of the passion: lastly, that those fruits are owing to the union of the Logos with the suffering humanity. These principles all naturally fall in with the accounts I have before given.

A.D. 200. *Tertullian.*

The sentiments of the African Christians, in those early days, may be probably judged of by Tertullian, a very learned and acute writer, who thus expresses them: 'Bread is the Word of the living God, which came down from heaven; besides that his body also is understood in bread: This is my body. Therefore in asking our daily bread, we ask for perpetuity in Christ, and to be undivided from his body [c].' Here our author teaches that the Divine nature of our Lord is our bread, and likewise that his human nature is our bread also, given us in or under the symbol of the sacramental bread. So Rigaltius [d] interprets the passage, quoting a similar passage of St. Austin:

in usu legitimo. Quam conjunctionem vulgo vocant unionem sacramentalem, sed non usque adeo convenienter; cum non signatum cum signo, sed nobiscum uniatur, eoque potius, minus saltem ambigue, conjunctio pacti debeat nominari.' Vossius, de Sacram. Vi et Effic. p. 250. Cp. Bucer. Script. Anglican. p. 544.

[a] Καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα. Αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον ἀλληγορεῖ νᾶμα. Clem. Paedag. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 186. I have altered the common pointing, for the improving the sense.

[b] Orig. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243. See above, p. 54, and compare Cyrill. Alex. contra Nestor. l. v. p. 123.

[c] 'Panis est Sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de caelis. Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur: Hoc est corpus meum. Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo, et individuitatem a corpore ejus.' Tertullian. de Orat. c. vi. pp. 131, 132.

[d] 'Sic videtur explicari posse: Per panis sacramentum commendat corpus suum: quemadmodum Augustinus l. i. Quaest. Evang. 43. dixit, Per vini sacramentum commendat sanguinem suum.' Rigalt. in loc.

but the reader may compare Albertinus [e]. We can allow the Romanists here to understand Christ's real and natural body given in the Sacrament, but mystically, spiritually, and interpretatively given; as a right may be given us to a distant possession. Tertullian seems to understand body, of the body glorified, because he speaks of our being undivided from it, and may best be explained of the mystical union between Christ and his members, perfected in this Sacrament: which kind of union, as I have more than once hinted, supposes no local corporal presence, nor infers any.

Tertullian elsewhere speaks of our bodies as being fed with the body and blood of Christ, that our souls may be feasted with God, or may feed upon God [f]. There I understand body and blood of Christ, of the sacramental, symbolical body and blood, that is, of the bread and wine, which literally nourish the body of man, and symbolically the soul. Signs often bear the names of the things signified, as Tertullian more than once intimates with reference to this very case [g]. And when he says, that Christ made the bread his own body [h], he must be understood of the symbolical body, (the figure, or symbol of the natural body,) representing [i] and exhibiting the thing signified.

But I must observe further, that when Tertullian builds an argument for the resurrection of the body upon this consideration, that our bodies are fed with the symbolical body of Christ, (as I have explained it,) he cannot be understood to mean less than that the symbolical body is constructionally or interpretatively the real body; and so our bodies are literally fed with one, while mystically and spiritually fed with the other also. Without this supposition, there is no force at all in his argument for the

[e] Albertinus de Eucharist. p. 344. He understands it thus: that bread is a name for the sacramental body, as well as for common bread, and for spiritual food, i.e. Christ himself.

[f] 'Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur: non possunt ergo separari in mercede, quas opera conjungit.' Tertull. de Resur. Carn. cap. viii. p. 330. Cp. Albertin. p. 340.

[g] 'Panem corpus suum appellans.' Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. x. p. 196. contr. Mar. lib. iii. cap. 19. p. 408.

[h] 'Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus illum suum fecit, HOC EST CORPUS MEUM dicendo: id est, figura corporis mei.' Contr. Marc. l. iv. cap. 40. p. 458.

[i] 'Panem quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat.' Contr. Marc. lib. i.

resurrection. Our bodies are considered as fed with Christ's natural body, therefore they are considered as pertaining to, or mingled with his body; therefore they are in construction one flesh with him; therefore, as his body is glorified, so also will ours be, head and members together. Such is the tour of the argument, such the chain of ideas that forms it[k]. Which is confirmed by what he adds, viz. that soul and body being partners in the work, will share also in the reward. What is the work? The work of feeding upon Christ: both feast together here upon the same Lord, therefore both shall enjoy the same Lord hereafter. Which inference implies that even our bodies are in some sense (namely, in the mystical and constructional sense) fed with our Lord's natural body, as crucified, or as glorified. Enough has been said, to give the reader a competent notion of Tertullian's doctrine on this head. I shall only take notice further, that the acute and learned Pfaffius, following the Lutheran hypothesis, has collected many testimonies seemingly favouring that side, but then, very ingenuously, has matched them with others which are directly repugnant to it; and he has left them facing each other[l], unreconciled, irreconcilable. How easily might all have been set right, had he but considered a very common thing, called construction of law, or duly attended to the symbolical language which Scripture and Fathers abound in. To what purpose is it to cite Fathers in any cause, without reconciling the evidence? Self-contradictory evidence is null or none. But I proceed.

A.D. 240. *Origen.*

Bullinger, in his treatise against Casaubon, cites a passage as Origen's which runs thus: 'He that partakes of the bread, partakes also of the Lord's body: for we look not to the objects of sense lying before us, but we lift up the soul by faith to the body of the Logos. For he said not, This is the symbol, but This is

[k] A collection of other ancient testimonies, so far as concerns that argument, may be seen in Johnson, (Unbl. Sacr. part ii. p. 110, &c.), though he does not account for it in the same way.

[l] Vid. Pfaffius de Consecrat. Vet. Euchar. pp. 465, 470, 471.

the body; to prevent any one's thinking that it was a type[m].' Albertinus throws off this passage as spurious, and as the product of some modern Greek[n]. Huetius comes after, and blames him for arbitrarily cutting the knot[o], as he supposes. But there would be no great difficulty in untying the knot, were it certain that the words are Origen's. I will suppose that they are; and indeed I see no good reason why they may not. He seems to have intended nothing more but to raise up vulgar minds from grovelling apprehensions to heavenly contemplations. Such exhortations to the populace are frequent in other Fathers. Origen admits not of naked signs, or mere figures: he was no Sacramentarian. He thought, very rightly, that the words of the institution were too strong and emphatical to submit to so low a meaning. He conceived that, under the symbolical body, was to be understood the natural body of Christ, the body of the Logos. If we take in another passage of Origen's, out of one of his Homilies[p], and join it with this, there will then appear a threefold, elegant gradation in his whole account, as thus: Look not to the typical body, but raise your minds higher up to the natural flesh of Christ: yea, and stop not there, but ascend still higher, from human to Divine, conceiving that flesh as personally united with the Divine Logos, or as the body of God. All which is true and sound doctrine, and very proper subject-matter for Christian exhortations: I need not add, that the whole is extremely suitable to what I have been maintaining all along in this chapter.

A.D. 250. *Cyprian.*

It is frequent with Cyprian to speak of the sacred elements under the name of our Lord's body and blood. I need not cite passages to prove what no one who has ever looked into that author can doubt of: in what sense he so styled them, pursuant

[m] Καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτου μετέχων, τοῦ σώματος κυρίου μεταλαμβάνει· οὐ γὰρ προσέχομεν τῇ φύσει τῶν αἰσθητῶς προκειμένων, ἀλλ' ἀνάγομεν τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ πίστεως ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου σῶμα. οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, τοῦτό ἐστι σύμβολον, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστι σῶμα· δεικτικῶς, ἵνα μὴ νομίζῃ τις τύπον εἶναι. Bulling. contr. Casaub. p. 617.

[n] Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. ii. cap. 3. p. 367.

[o] Huetii Origeniana, p. 182.

[p] 'Non haereas in sanguine carnis, sed disce potius sanguinem Verbi,' &c. Orig. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243.

to the words of the institution, is the single question. He says, in a certain place, that our Lord, in the original Eucharist, offered up bread and wine, viz. his own body and blood [q]. It is plain that he thought not of transubstantiation, since he calls the elements bread and wine, even after consecration, and supposes besides, that Christ offered the same in substance that Melchizedeck had offered long before the incarnation. Neither could Cyprian think of consubstantiation, since he admits of no other body and blood as there present, and literally offered, but the same individual bread and wine: they were the body and blood. But how were they such, since they were not so, strictly and literally? I answer, they were figuratively such, according to our author: not that the elements were by him supposed to be mere figures, or memorials, or representations; but what they represented, that they represented with effect, and so amounted in just construction and beneficial influence to the same thing. This was the notion he had of them, as will sufficiently appear from several clear passages. He supposes the natural blood of Christ by which we are redeemed, to be in the cup, in some sense or other, when the sacred wine is there [r]: the wine represents it, stands for it, and is interpretatively the same thing. He could not well mean less than this, by saying, that the blood is signified (ostenditur) in the wine, and that it is supposed to be in the cup, 'videtur esse in calice,' is looked upon as being there. Not literally to be sure, but constructionally, and in effect: for the effects, according to him, upon every faithful receiver, are remission of sins [s], and spiritual strength against the adversary [t], and

[q] 'Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedech obtulerat, id est, panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.' Cypr. Epist. lxiii. p. 105. ed. Bened., alias p. 149.

[r] 'Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur, qui Scripturarum omnium Sacramento ac testimonio praedicatur.' Ep. lxiii. p. 104.

[s] 'Epotato sanguine Domini et poculo salutari, exponatur memoria veteris hominis, et fiat oblivio conversationis pristinae saecularis, et moestum pectus et triste, quod prius peccatis angentibus premebatur, Divinae indulgentiae laetitia resolvatur.' Cypr. Ep. lxiii. p. 107, alias 153.

[t] 'Protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus; et cum ad hoc fiat Eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela, quos tutos esse con-

life eternal [u]. So far was he from the low and degrading notions of the figurists in this article; and yet sufficiently guarded (as I have before hinted) against another extreme.

There are no more considerable authorities to be met with, so far as concerns this article, till we come down to the fourth century, and so on; and there they are innumerable: all following the same tenor of doctrine, all, when rightly understood, teaching the same thing, in the main, with what I have here represented from their predecessors; so that I know not whether it might not be tedious to my readers, to proceed any further in a recital of this kind. But I may single out one, as it were, by way of specimen, leaving the rest to be judged of by that: and that one may be Cyril of Jerusalem, as proper a sample perhaps as any.

A.D. 348. *Cyril of Jerusalem.*

I do not know any one writer, among the ancients, who has given a fuller or clearer, or in the main juster account of the holy Eucharist, than this the elder Cyril has done; though he has often been strangely misconstrued by contending parties. The true and ancient notions of the Eucharist came now to be digested into somewhat of a more regular and accurate form, and the manner of speaking of it became, as it were, fixed and settled upon rules of art. Cyril expresses himself thus: 'Receive we [the Eucharist] with all fulness of faith, as the body and blood of Christ: for, under the type [or symbol] of bread, you have his body given you, and under the type [or symbol] of wine, you receive his blood; that so partaking of the body and blood of Christ, you may become flesh of his flesh, and blood of his blood. For, by this means, we carry Christ about us, in as much as his body and blood is distributed into our members: thus do we become, according to St. Peter, partakers of the Divine nature [x].' The doctrine here taught is, that in the Eucha-

tra adversarium volumus, munimento Dominicae saturitatis armemus.' Ep. liv. p. 77, alias Ep. lvii. p. 117.

[u] 'Manifestum est eos vivere qui corpus ejus attingunt, et Eucharistiam jure communicationis accipiunt.' Cypr. de Orat. pp. 209, 210.

[x] Μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας. ὡς σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ· ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, δίδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου

rist we receive (not literally, but symbolically) the natural body and blood of Christ; just as the priests of old, in eating the sacrifices symbolically, but effectually, ate up the sins of the people, or as the faithful Israelites, in eating manna and drinking of the rock, effectually fed upon Christ. The symbolical body and blood are here supposed by our author to supply the place of the natural, and to be in construction and beneficial effect (not substantially) the same thing with it; and so he speaks of our becoming by that means one flesh and one blood with Christ, meaning it in as high a sense, as all the members of Christ are one body, or as man and wife are one flesh. We carry Christ about us, as we are mystically united to him. His body and blood are considered as intermingled with ours [y], when the symbols of them really and strictly are so: for the benefit is completely the same; and God accepts of such symbolical union, making it, to all saving purposes and intents, as effectual as any the most real could be. Cyril never thought of any presence of Christ's natural body and blood in the Sacrament, excepting in mystery and figure, (which he expresses by the word 'type,') and in real benefits and privileges.

He goes on to observe, that our Lord once told the Jews (John vi. 54) of eating his flesh, &c. And they not understanding

δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα, ἵνα γένῃ, μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ, σύσσωμος καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα, τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα ἀναδιδομένου μέλη. οὕτω, κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως γινόμεθα. Cyrill. Hierosol. Mystag. iv. sect. 3. p. 320. ed. Bened.

[y] Chrysostom, in like manner, speaks of Christ's intermingling his body with ours, in the Eucharist; but explains it, at length, by the mystical union therein contracted, or perfected between Christ the head, and us his members. ....*ἀνεμίξεν ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀνέφυρε τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἕν τι ὑπάρξωμεν, καθάπερ σῶμα κεφαλῇ συνημμένον.* Chrysost. in Joan. Hom. xlvi. p. 272. Cp. in Matt. Hom. lxxxiii. p. 788.

'To shew the fervour of his affection towards us, he has mingled himself with us, and diffused his own body into us, that so we may become one thing, as a body joined with the head.' Cp. Cyril. Alex. In Joan. pp. 365, 862. De Sanct. Trin. p. 407. Isidor. Pelus. lib. iii. ep. 195. p. 333.

N.B. Chrysostom elsewhere speaks as highly of Baptism, and of the mingling with our Lord's body, in that Sacrament also, [in Coloss. Hom. vi. p. 201]; all which means nothing but the mystical union. Chamier has discussed this whole matter at large, if the reader desires further satisfaction. De Eucharist. lib. xi. cap. 8, 9. p. 633, &c.

that it was spoken spiritually, [but taking the thing literally,] were offended at it, as if he had been persuading them to devour his flesh [z]. Hence it appears further, that our author was no friend to the gross, literal construction. He proceeds as follows: 'Under the New Testament we have heavenly bread, and a cup of salvation, sanctifying both body and soul: for as bread answers to body, so the Logos suits with the soul [a].' This thought may be compared with another of Clemens above, somewhat like, and somewhat different. But both agree in two main points, that the Eucharist sanctifies the worthy receiver both in body and soul, and that Christ is properly present in his Divine nature. Wherefore Cyril had the more reason for pressing his exhortation afterwards in high and lofty terms: 'Consider them [the elements] not as mere bread and wine; for by our Lord's express declaration, they are the body and blood of Christ. And though your taste may suggest that to you, [viz. that they are mere bread and wine,] yet let your faith keep you firm. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but under a full persuasion of faith be you undoubtedly assured, that you are vouchsafed the body and blood of Christ [b].' This he said to draw off the minds

[z] Ἐκεῖνοι μὴ ἀκηκοότες πνευματικῶς τῶν λεγομένων, σκανδαλισθέντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, νομίζοντες ὅτι ἐπὶ σαρκοφαγίαν αὐτοὺς προτρέπεται. Cyril. ibid. p. 321.

Touttée, the Benedictine, here blames our learned Milles for rendering 'quae spiritualiter dicebantur, non intelligerent,' instead of 'quae dicebantur, spiritualiter non intelligerent.' The criticism appears too nice, making a distinction without a difference; for the sense is the same either way. The Capernaites were here censured for not spiritually construing what was spiritually intended; for taking literally, what was meant spiritually: which is what either translation at length resolves into.

[a] Ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ, ἄρτος οὐράνιος, καὶ ποτήριον σωτηρίου, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἁγιάζοντα· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος σώματι κατάλληλος, οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος τῇ ψυχῇ ἁρμόδιος. Cyril. ibid. p. 231.

[b] Μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κατὰ δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω, μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως πληροφοροῦ ἀνενδοιάστως σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς. Ibid. p. 321.

N.B. The first Nicene Council (if we may credit Gelasius) had words to the same effect with these of Cyril: not with any intent to declare the nature or substance of the consecrated elements, (which none could doubt of,) but to engage the attention to their appointed use, and to the graces therein signified and conveyed. Vid. Gelas. Cyzicen. part 2. concil. tom. i. p. 427. ed. Hard. Cp. Albertin. p. 384, &c. Bishop Moreton has largely explained it, b. iv. chap. 11. sect. ii. p. 302, &c.

of his audience from low and carnal apprehensions, that so they might view those mysteries with the eye of faith, and not merely with the eye of sense; might look through the outward sign, to the inward thing signified, and regale their spiritual taste more than the sensual. This is what Cyril really meant: though some moderns, coming to read him either with transubstantiation or consubstantiation in their heads, have amused themselves with odd constructions of very innocent words.

As to his exhorting his audience not to take the elements for mere bread and wine, it is just such another kind of address as he had before made to them, first in relation to the waters of Baptism, and next with regard to the Chrism. 'Look not to this laver, as to ordinary water, but (attend) to the grace conferred with the water [c].' Would any sensible man conclude from hence, that the water was transubstantiated, according to our author, into some other substance? Let us go on to what he says of the Chrism. 'Have a care of suspecting that this is ordinary ointment, [or mere ointment]; for, like as the sacramental bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no more bare bread, but the body of Christ, so also this holy unguent is no more bare ointment, nor to be called common, after the invocation; but it is the grace of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, endowed with special energy by the presence of his Godhead: and it is symbolically spread over the forehead and other parts of the body. So then the body is anointed with the visible unguent, but the soul is sanctified by the enlivening Spirit [d].'

I cite not this, as approving all that Cyril has here said of the Chrism, (not standing upon Scripture authority,) but to give light to what he has said of the Eucharist, which he compares

[c] Μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λουτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος διδομένῃ χάριτι. Cyrill. Catech. iii. p. 40. Vid. Albertin. 429. Cp. Chrysostom. in Matt. Hom. lxxxiii. p. 787.

[d] Ἀλλ' ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μύρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν· ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, παρουσίᾳ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐνεργετικὸν γινόμενον. ὅπερ συμβολικῶς ἐπὶ μετώπου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σου χρίεται αἰσθητηρίων. καὶ τῷ φαινομένῳ μύρῳ τὸ σῶμα χρίεται, τῷ δὲ ἁγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ πνεύματι ἡ ψυχὴ ἁγιάζεται. Mystag. iii. p. 317. Cp. Gregor. Nyssen. de Baptism. tom. iii. p. 369.

with the other, while he supposes the cases parallel. He conceived the elements in one case, and the unguent in the other, to be exhibitive symbols of spiritual graces, instrumentally conveying what they represent. The bread and wine, according to his doctrine, are symbolically the body and blood: and by symbolically he means the very same thing which I have otherwise expressed by saying, that they are the body and blood in just construction and beneficial effect. What Cyril feared with respect to Baptism, and the Eucharist, and the Unction, was, that many in low life (coming perhaps from the plough, the spade, or the pale) might be dull of apprehension, and look no higher than to what they saw, felt or tasted. Upon the like suspicion was grounded the ancient solemn preface to the Communion Service, called Sursum Corda by the Latins: wherein the officiating minister admonished the communicants to lift up their hearts, and they made answer, We lift them up unto the Lord [e].

To make the point we have been upon still plainer, let Cyril be heard again, as he expresses the thing in a succeeding lecture. 'You hear the Psalmist with divine melody inviting you to the communion of the holy mysteries, and saying, Taste and see how gracious the Lord is. Leave it not to the bodily palate to judge: no, but to faith clear of all doubting. For the tasters are not commanded to taste bread and wine, but the antitype [symbol] of the body and blood of Christ [f].' Here our author plainly owns the elements to be types, or symbols (as he had done also before,) and therefore not the very things whereof they are symbols; not literally and strictly, but interpretatively, mystically, and to all saving purposes and intents; which suffices [g].

[e] Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας. Cyril. Mystag. v. p. 326. Cyprian. de Orat. Domin. p. 213, alias 152. Cp. Bingham, b. xv. c. 3. sect. 3. Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. vol. i. p. 226.

[f] Ἀκούετε τοῦ ψάλλοντος, μετὰ μέλους θείου προτρεπομένου ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, καὶ λέγοντος, γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. μὴ τῷ λάρυγγι τῷ σωματικῷ ἐπιτρέπετε τὸ κριτικόν. οὐχί, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνενδοιάστῳ πίστει. γευόμενοι γὰρ οὐκ ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου κελεύονται γεύσασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀντιτύπου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Mystag. v. p. 331.

[g] Deylingius seems to wonder at Mr. Aubertine and Mr. Claude for under-commenting, as he conceives, with respect to Cyril: Deyling. Observ. Miscell. p. 157. But he attempts not to confute what they had said: it was wiser to forbear. The utmost that any one can justly make of the very strongest expressions in Cyril, can amount only to a mystical union

It is no marvel, if Mr. Touttée[h] and other Romanists interpret Cyril to quite another purpose: but one may justly wonder how the learned and impartial Dr. Grabe should construe Cyril in that gross sense, which he mentions under the name of augmentation[i]. I presume, he read Cyril with an eye to modern controversy, and did not consider him as speaking to mechanics and day-labourers: or, he was not aware of the difference there is between telling men what they are to believe, and what they ought to attend to, which was Cyril's chief aim. As to believing, he very well knew that every one would believe his senses, and take bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, as himself believed also: but he was afraid of their attending so entirely to the report of their senses, as to forget the reports of sacred Writ, which ought to be considered at the same time, and with closer attention than the other, as being of everlasting concernment. In short, he intended no lecture of faith against eyesight: but he endeavoured, as much as possible, to draw off their attention[k] from the objects of sense to the object of faith, and from the signs to the things signified.

It has been urged, as of moment, that Cyril compared the change made in the Eucharist to the miraculous change of water into wine wrought by our Lord in Cana of Galilee[l]. It is true that he did so: but similitudes commonly are no arguments of anything more than of some general resemblance. There was power from above in that case, and so is there in this: and it

of Christ's body with the faithful communicants, as members of him; which is such an union as St. Paul resembles to that whereby man and wife are one flesh, (Eph. v. 30, 31,) and which undoubtedly is a moral union, independent of local presence.

[h] Touttée, Dissert. iii. prefixed to his new edition of Cyril, c. ix. p. 204, &c. The reader may compare Albertinus, (p. 422,) who had sufficiently obviated everything pleadable on the side of the Romanists. Compare also Johnson, (Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 257,) who has well defended Cyril on this head, and Deylingius, who in a set discourse has replied to Touttée. (Deyling. Observat. Miscell. Exercit. ii. p. 163, &c.) Only I may note, by the way, that he has strained some things in favour of the Lutheran principles, and has better confuted the Romanists than he has established his own hypothesis.

[i] Grabe, ad Iren. lib. v. cap. 2. in notis, p. 399. Cp. Deyling. Observat. Miscellan. p. 177.

[k] 'In Sacramentis non quid sint, sed quid ostendant, attenditur; quoniam signa sunt rerum, aliud existentia et aliud significantia.' Augustin. contr. Max. lib. iii. cap. 22: cp. de Doct. Christ. cap. 7.

[l] Cyril. Mystag. iv. sect. 2. p. 320.

may be justly called a supernatural power[m]; not upon the elements to change their nature, but upon the communicants to add spiritual strength to their souls. The operation in the Eucharist is no natural work of any creature, but the supernatural grace of God's Holy Spirit. Therefore Cyril's thought was not much amiss, in resembling one supernatural operation to another, agreeing in the general thing, differing in specialities. In a large sense of the word miracle, there are miracles of grace, as well as miracles of nature; and the same Divine power operates in both, but in a different way, as the ends and objects are different.

I shall proceed no further with the Fathers on this head, because it would be tedious, and in a manner endless. None of them, that I know of, carried the doctrine higher than this Cyril did; but most of them, somewhere or other, added particular guards and explanations[n]. All intended to say, that the elements keeping their own nature and substance, and not admitting a coalition with any other bodily substance, are symbolically or in mystical construction, the body and blood of Christ; being appointed as such by Christ, accepted as such by God the Father, and made such in effect by the Holy Spirit, to every faithful receiver. So ran the general doctrine from the beginning and downwards: neither am I aware of any considerable change

[m] 'Neque quaeritur aut controvertitur an panis et vinum supernaturali virtute, et omnipotentia divina a communi elementorum usu, in sublimiorem usum et dignitatem transmutentur: fatemur enim in Sacramentis omnino necesse esse, caelestem et supernaturalem mutationem supervenire, nec posse fieri Sacramentum nisi per omnipotentiam Dei, cujus solius est Sacramenta in ecclesia instituere, ipsisque efficaciam tribuere.' Cosin. Hist. Transubst. cap. iv. p. 35; cp. p. 124. Compare Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 258, alias 261. Albertin. 855.

[n] For a specimen, we may take notice of Facundus, as late as the middle of the sixth century, who writes thus:

'Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et calice consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis, sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus sanguinisque contineant. Hinc et ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem, quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit. Quocirca, sicut Christi fideles, Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus accipientes, corpus et sanguinem Christi recte dicuntur accipere; sic et ipse Christus Sacramentum adoptionis filiorum cum suscepisset, potuit recte dici adoptionem filiorum accepisse.' Facund. Hermian. lib. ix. cap. 5. Cp. Ephraem. Antioch. in Phot. Cod. 229. p. 793.

made in it till the dark ages came on, the eighth, ninth, tenth, and following centuries[o]. The corruptions which grew up by degrees, and prevailed more and more till the happy days of reformation, are very well known[p], and need no particular recital.

Luther first, and afterwards Zuinglius, attempted a reform in this article: but it was difficult to clear off the thick darkness all at once; and so neither of them did it to such perfection as might have been wished. One threw off transubstantiation very justly, but yet retained I know not what corporal, local presence, and therefore did not retrench enough: the other threw off all corporal and local presence very rightly, but threw off withal (or too much neglected) the spiritual presence and spiritual graces: which was retrenching a great deal too much[q]. It must however be owned, that apologies have been since made for Zuinglius, as for one that erred in expression rather than in real meaning, or that corrected his sentiments on second thoughts[r]. And it is certain that his friends and followers, within a while, came into the old and true notion of spiritual benefits[s], and left the low notion of naked signs and figures to the Anabaptists of those times; where they rested, till again revived by the Socinians, who afterwards handed them down to the Remonstrants.

Calvin came after Zuinglius, and refined upon his scheme, steering a kind of middle course, between the extremes. He appears to have set out right, laying his groundwork with good judgment: and had he but as carefully built upon it after-

[o] See l'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part ii. cap. 12, 13, &c.

[p] In the year 787 the second Council of Nice began with a rash determination, that the sacred symbols are not figures or images at all, but the very body and blood. About 831, Paschasius Radbertus carried it further, even to transubstantiation, or somewhat very like to it. The name of transubstantiation is supposed to have come in about A. D. 1100, first mentioned by Hildebertus Cenomanensis of that time, p. 689. edit. Bened. A.D. 1215, the doctrine was made an article of faith by the Lateran Council, under Innocent the Third. Afterwards, it was re-established in the Trent Council, A.D. 1551, and at length in Pope Pius's Creed, A.D. 1564.

[q] Vid. Calvin. de Coena Domini, p. 10. et contr. Westphal. pp. 707, 774.

[r] See Archbishop Wake, Discourse on the Holy Eucharist, p. 83.

[s] See Hooker, vol. ii. p. 327.

wards, no fault could have been justly found. In the first edition of his Institutions, (printed at Basil A.D. 1536,) he writes thus: 'We say that they [the body and blood] are truly and efficaciously exhibited to us, but not naturally. By which we mean, not that the very substance of his body, or that the real and natural body of Christ are there given, but all the benefits which Christ procured for us in his body. This is that presence of his body which the nature of a Sacrament requires[t].' This came very near the truth, and the whole truth: only there was an ambiguity, which he was not aware of, in the words there given; and so, for want of a proper distinction, his account was too confused. He should have said, that the natural body is there given, but not there present, which is what he really meant. The mystical union with our Lord's glorified body is there (or in that service) strengthened, or perfected; as a right may be given to a distant possession: and such union as we now speak of, requires no local presence of Christ's body. Here that great man and illustrious reformer was somewhat embroiled, and could never sufficiently extricate himself afterwards. He was well aware, that to assert only an application of the merit or virtue of Christ's passion, in the Eucharist, came not fully up to many strong expressions of the ancient Fathers relating to our union with the natural and now glorified body: nay, it appeared to fall short of St. Paul's doctrine, which represents the true disciples of Christ, as members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones[u]. I say, Calvin was well aware of this difficulty, and more especially after he had been warmly pressed on that head, in his disputes with the Lutherans. So he found himself to be under a necessity of bringing in the natural body some way or other[w], but did

[t] 'Dicimus vere et efficaciter exhiberi, non autem naturaliter. Quo scilicet significamus, non substantiam ipsam corporis, seu verum et naturale Christi corpus illic dari, sed omnia quae in suo corpore nobis beneficia Christus praestitit. Ea est corporis praesentia quam Sacramenti ratio postulat.' Calvin. Instit. apud Wake, p. 47.

[u] Ephes. v. 30.

[w] 'Neque enim mortis tantum ac resurrectionis suae beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum in quo passus est et resurrexit. Concludo, realiter, hoc est vere, nobis in coena dari Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem.... Intelligo, substantia corporis pasci animas nostras, ut vere unum efficiamur cum eo: vel, quod idem valet, vim ex Christi carne vivificam in nos per

it a little confusedly, and out of course. He made it the ground[x], instead of reckoning it among the fruits: and he supposed the glorified body to be, as it were, eaten in the Eucharist, when he should only have said, that it became more perfectly united with ours: and he further invented an obscure and unintelligible notion of the virtue of Christ's flesh being brought down from heaven and diffused all around, by the power of the Holy Spirit[y]. All which perplexity seems to have been owing to the wrong stating of a notion, which yet was true in the main, and which wanted only to be better adjusted, by a more orderly ranging of ideas, or by new casting it; which has been done since.

Our Divines, who came after Calvin, had some advantage in point of time, and a greater still in the rule or method which they pitched upon, as most proper to proceed by: which was, not to strike out any new hypothesis or theories by strength of wit, but to inquire after the old paths, and there to abide. Archbishop Cranmer took this method: he was a judicious man, and a well-read Divine; and more particularly in what concerns the Eucharist. We have the sum of his doctrine in the first page of his preface.

'Where I use to speake sometymes, (as the olde authours doo,) that Christe is in the Sacramentes, I meane the same as they dyd understand the mattier: that is to say, not of Christes carnall presence in the outwarde Sacrament, but sometymes of his sacramentall presence; and sometyme by this woorde sacrament I meane the whole mynistration and receyvynge of the Sacramentes, eyther of Baptisme or of the Lordes Supper. And

Spiritum diffundi, quamvis longe a nobis distat, nec misceatur nobiscum.' Calvin. in 1 Cor. xi. 24. p. 392. Cp. contr. Westphal. pp. 774, 784.

[x] Vid. Beza, Orat. apud Placaei Comment. de Stat. Relig. p. 112. Bishop Cosin follows the same way of speaking; Histor. Transubstan. pp. 35, 43, 44, 45.

[y] 'Plus centies occurrit in scriptis meis, adeo me non rejicere substantiae nomen, ut ingenue et libere profitear spiritualem vitam, incomprehensibili spiritus virtute ex carnis Christi substantia in nos diffundi.' Calvin. contr. Westphal. p. 842. cp. 843.

'Corpus quod nequaquam cernis, spirituale est tibi alimentum. Incredibile hoc videtur, pasci nos Christi carne, quae tam procul a nobis distat? meminerimus, arcanum et mirificum esse. Spiritus Sancti opus, quod intelligentiae tuae modulo metiri sit nefas.' Calvin. in 1 Cor. xi. 24. p. 392.

so the olde writers many tymes dooe say, that Christe and the Holy Ghoste be present in the Sacramentes; not meanynge by that manner of speache, that Christe and the Holy Ghoste be presente in the water, bread, or wyne, (whiche be only the outward vysyble Sacramentes,) but that in the dewe mynistration of the Sacramentes, accordynge to Christes ordynance and institution, Christe and his Holy Spirite be trewly and indede present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace in all them that worthily receyve the same. Moreover, when I saye and repeate many tymes in my booke, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthyly receave the Sacramente, leaste any man shulde mystake my woordes, and thynke that I mean, that although Christe be not corporally in the outward visible sygnes, yet hee is corporally in the persones that duely receive them; this is to advertise the reader, that I meane no suche thynge: but my meanyng is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefyte of Christes bodye that was crucifyed for us, and of his bloudde that was shedde for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duely receave the Sacramentes. But all this I understande of his spiritual presence, of the whyche hee saythe, I wyll bee with you untyll the worldes ende: and, Wheresoever two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the myddes of them: and, He that eateth my fleshe, and drynketh my bloude, dwelleth in me, and I in hym. Nor no more truely is he corporally or really presente in the due mynistration of the Lordes Supper, than he is in the due mynistration of Baptisme [z].' It is observable, that our judicious author wisely avoids saying anything of the eating of Christ's glorified body, for he speaks of the crucified only, and justly explains the spiritual manducation of it. He drops all mention here of the mystical union with the body glorified, and so his account may be thought a little defective as to that particular: but he frequently takes notice of it in his book, as one of the effects or

[z] Cranmer's Answ. to Gardiner, edit. 1551. In the edition of 1580 there is added, to the passage cited, as follows: 'That is to say, in both spiritually by grace: and whereso-ever in the Scripture it is said that Christ, God, or the Holy Ghost is in any man, the same is understood spiritually by grace.'

fruits of the spiritual manducation in the Eucharist, which strengthens and confirms the worthy receivers as members of Christ's natural body[a].

I may spare myself the trouble of reciting the sentiments of Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Latimer, and Mr. Bradford of that time, and of Bishop Jewel who came not long after: for they all agreed, in the main things, with Archbishop Cranmer, who may therefore be looked upon as 'instar omnium,' while in him we have all. I shall only take notice how our acutest Divines have, time after time, hit off the difficulties which were once very perplexing, by the use of proper distinctions, between the body crucified and the body glorified; as likewise between manducation and union. It will be sufficient to name two of them: one wrote as early as the days of Queen Elizabeth, and the other as late as King James the Second.

Dr. William Barlow[b], in the year 1601, published a treatise entitled, A Defence of the Articles of the Protestant Religion; which he dedicated to Bancroft, then Bishop of London: he occasionally says something upon our present subject, which may be worth the noting, though the style is not the most commendable.

'Great difference there is (perchance not observed by many) between our eating of Christ, and our uniting with him[c]. . . .

'1. We eat him as our Passover[d]; that as the Israelites ate the one "mortuum et assum," dead and roasted[e], so we him "crucifixum et passum," dead and slain. And so that speech of St. Austin is true, we have him here "in pabulo" as he was "in patibulo," torn and rent: as himself ordained the Sacrament "in pane fracto," not "integro," the bread broken, not the whole loaf; thereby signifying, yea saying, that in doing it we must remember him, not as living among us, but as dying for us; "ut in cruce, non in caelo," as he was crucified, not as he is glorified. Whereby

[a] Cranmer, pp. 16, 27, 43, 44, 161, 174, 199. Compare Jewel, Answ. to Harding, art. v. p. 254, &c.

[b] The same that published a relation of the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, and was made Bishop of Rochester in 1605, translated to Lincoln in 1608, died 1613.

[c] Barlow's Defence, &c. p. 124, &c.

[d] 2 Cor. v. 7.

[e] Exod. xii. 9.

we conclude, first, for his presence, that his body is so far forth there "quatenus editur," as it is eaten: but his body is eaten as dead and slain; so himself appointed it, This is my body, and stayeth not there, but adds withal, Which is given for you. And his blood is drunk, not as remaining in his veins, but as shed: so himself speaketh, This is my blood of the new testament SHED for many. Now, his body bruised, and his blood poured out, can no otherwise be present in the Eucharist, but by a representation thereof in the bread broken, and in the wine effused, of the one side; and on the communicant's part, by a grateful recordation of the benefits, a reverent valuation of the sacrifice, a faithful application of his merits in his whole passion: and therefore his presence must be sacramental, and our eating spiritual; for, "non quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit," saith St. Austin.

'2. For the union, we are united to him "ut viventi," as our living head, "et nos vivificanti," and making us his lively members. It is true which Christ saith, that He which eateth my flesh, abideth in me, and I in him[f]. Not that this union is first begun in our participation of that holy Supper, (for none can truly eat the body of Christ, unless he be first united with him, and ingrafted into him: "nec vere edit corpus Christi, qui non est de corpore Christi," saith St. Austin,) because "prima unio," (saith Aquinas,) the first union between God and man is begun in Baptism by one Spirit[g], as the Apostle speaketh, and continueth, by faith, hope, and charity; all these the operation of the same Spirit.

'But if we truly eat the body, and drink the blood of Christ, then by the power of the Holy Ghost, and faith co-operating, this union is strengthened, the vigour and effects whereof, after a true participation, we shall feel within ourselves more forcible and lively. . . . Is not Christ as present in Baptism, as in the Eucharist? for in them both we communicate with him; bred anew in the one, fed anew in the other: and yet Christ's real presence is not challenged for Baptism. If they say: No, because of the Eucharist it was said, This is my body and blood, not so

[f] John vi. 56. [g] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

of Baptism; I answer: As much, if not more, was spoken by the Apostle; They which are baptized have put on Christ [h]. Put him on we cannot, unless he be present: and the putting him on is even the very same which he elsewhere calleth Christ's dwelling in us [i], namely, that in Baptism we are so transformed, as now not we, but Christ alone doth live within us [k]; as near an unity as may [l]. And in truth St. Austin is out of doubt, that in Baptism the true member of Christ "corporis et sanguinis Domini particeps fit," is partaker of the body and blood of the Lord [m]: and therefore no reason withstands, but that he should be really present in both, or in neither.' Thus far Bishop Barlow, whose words I have here quoted at length, chiefly for the sake of the distinction (as it is a very good one) between the manducation and the union; the former relating properly to Christ considered as crucified and slain, and the latter to Christ considered as glorified and living for evermore. We eat him as from the cross; that is, we partake of the merits of his passion; and one of the fruits of his passion is our mystical union with his body now glorified in heaven. One thing only I think wants correcting in Barlow's account, that he seems to make the union antecedent in natural order to the manducation; which, I conceive, was needless with respect to his argument, and is besides wrong in itself, since our reconciliation by the death of Christ is, in

[h] Gal. iii. 27. Cp. Phot. Amphiloch. apud Wolf. Cur. Crit. vol. ult. p. 737.

[i] Ephes. iii. 17. N.B. The observation here urged appears to be perfectly just, and may be of great use for discovering the weakness of the pleas made for the real and local presence in the other Sacrament. The learned Buddæus, for instance, pleads, that the giving of the body cannot be understood without such real presence of the body; and that no communion can be without such real presence: '*Κοινωνία* inter res quae sibi invicem praesentes non sunt, esse nequit.' Institut. Theol. Dogmat. lib. v. cap. i. p. 1094. The argument manifestly proves too much; proving (as Barlow well notes) that Christ is so really present in both Sacraments, or in neither. If Christ means whole Christ, he must be as much present in body, to be put on in Baptism, as to be orally taken in the Eucharist: but who sees not that this is straining figurative expressions to a most extravagant excess?

[k] Gal. ii. 20.

[l] I may here note, that the learned Wolfius on Gal. iii. 27 allows, that the putting on Christ implies 'arctissimam communionem,' (p. 740,) the closest communion. Now compare Buddaeus's argument, or maxim, built upon the word communion, as implying real presence, and then judge of the conclusion resulting from the premises.

[m] See Fulgentius above, p. 564.

natural order of conception, prior to all the blessings and privileges arising from it. It is true that Baptism must be before the Eucharist, and that the mystical union is begun in Baptism: but then, (as our author himself afterwards very justly observes) we partake of our Lord's body broken, and blood shed, that is, of his death and passion, even in Baptism; and that is the ground and foundation of all our other Christian privileges.

Another excellent writer, whom I had in my eye, and now intend to cite, is Dr. Aldrich, who in the year 1687 published a valuable pamphlet, entitled a Reply to Two Discourses, where, in a very clear and elegant style, and with great acuteness, he has hit off the main difficulties relating to the real presence. He writes thus:

'The natural body of our blessed Saviour comes under a twofold consideration in the Eucharist:

'1. As a body dead: under which notion we are said to eat it in the Sacrament, and to drink the blood as shed; as appears by the words of the institution, Take and eat; this is my body, which is given or broken for you: drink ye all of this; for this is my blood, which is shed for you: in which words, as Mr. Bradford long ago observed, what God has joined, we are not to put asunder.

'2. As a glorified body: in which condition it now sits at the right hand of God, and shall there continue till the restitution of all things, imparting grace and influence, and all the benefits purchased by the sacrifice of the dead body, to those that, in the holy Eucharist most especially, are through faith and the marvellous operation of the Holy Ghost, incorporated into Christ, and so united to him, that they dwell in Christ and Christ in them, they are one with Christ and Christ with them, they are made members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; and by partaking of the spirit of him their head, receive all the graces and benefits purchased for them by his bitter death and passion.

'Wherefore it is evident, that since the body broken, and blood shed, neither do nor can now really exist, they neither can be really present, nor literally eaten or drank; nor can we really receive them, but only the benefits purchased by them. But the

body which now exists, whereof we partake, and to which we are united, is the glorified body: which is therefore verily and indeed received . . . and by consequence said to be really present, notwithstanding its local absence; because a real participation and union must needs imply a real presence, though they do not necessarily require a local one. For it is easy to conceive, how a thing that is locally absent may yet be really received, . . . as we commonly say, a man receives an estate, or inheritance, when he receives the deeds or conveyances of it. . . . The reception is confessedly real, though the thing itself is not locally or circumscriptively present, or literally grasped in the arms of the receiver. . . . The Protestants all agree, that we spiritually eat Christ's body, and drink his blood; that we neither eat, nor drink, nor receive the dead body, nor the blood shed, but only the benefits purchased by them; that those benefits are derived to us by virtue of our union and communion with the glorified body[n], and that our partaking of it and union with it is effected by the mysterious and ineffable operation of the Holy Spirit. . . .

'Now though it be easy, as I said before, to conceive how a natural substance may be said to be really received, though not locally present, it is not so easy to conceive it really present, when at the same time it is locally absent. Therefore the Church of England has wisely forborne to use the term of "real presence," in all the books that are set forth by her authority. We neither find it recommended in the Liturgy, nor the Articles, nor the Homilies, nor the Church's, nor Nowell's Catechism. . . . So that if any Church of England man use it, he does more than the Church directs him: if any reject it, he has the Church's example to warrant him. . . . Yet it must not be denied but the term may be safely used amongst scholars, and seems to be grounded upon Scripture itself[o]. . . .

'So much for the use of the word; which when we of the Church of England use, we mean thus: A thing may be said to be really received, which is so consigned to us, that we can really

[n] How this is to be understood, see above, pp. 96, 97.

[o] Here the author refers to several texts, Matthew xviii. 20; xxviii. 20; 1 Cor. v. 3.

employ it to all those purposes for which it is useful in itself, and we have occasion to use it. And a thing thus really received may be said to be really present, two ways, either physically or morally, to which we reduce sacramentally. . . . In the holy Eucharist, the Sacrament is physically, the res sacramenti morally present; the elements antecedently and locally; the very body consequentially and virtually, but both really present. . . . When we say that Christ is present . . . in the Sacrament, we do not mean in the elements, but in the celebration. . . . This doctrine is sufficiently removed from what the pamphlet calls Zuinglianism, (how truly, I will not now inquire,) for we do not hold that we barely receive the effects and benefits of Christ's body, but we hold it really present inasmuch as it is really received, and we actually put in possession of it, though locally absent from us [p].'

I have transcribed thus much, because the account is just, and because the pamphlet and defence of it are not, it may be, commonly known. The sum of all is, that sacramental or symbolical feeding in the Eucharist is feeding upon the body broken and blood shed, under the signs and symbols of bread and wine: the result of such feeding, is the strengthening or perfecting our mystical union with the body glorified; and so, properly speaking, we feed upon the body as dead, and we receive it into closer union as living, and both in the Eucharist when duly celebrated.

Nothing now remains, before I close up this chapter, but to hint very briefly the use of the foregoing principles for the clearing off difficulties, and for the removing the objections raised by contending parties of various kinds.

1. To the Romanists, who plead warmly for the very body and blood in the Eucharist, we make answer, that we do receive the very body and blood in it, and through it, as properly as a man receives an estate, and becomes possessed of an inheritance by any deeds or conveyances: and what would they have more? Will nothing satisfy, except the wax and parchments be transubstantiated into terra firma, or every instrument converted into arable? Surely, that is pushing points too far, and turning things most serious into perfect ridicule.

[p] Dr. Aldrich's Reply to Two Discourses, pp. 13–18.

2. To the Lutherans, who seem to contend for a mixture of the visible elements with the body invisible, we have this to reply, that we readily admit of a symbolical delivery, or conveyance, of one by the other; which effectually answers every good end and purpose, as it suits also extremely well with the Scripture phraseology in those cases. And though we admit not, that our Lord's body is locally present in the Sacrament, or any where so present but in heaven; yet so long as it is really united in one mystical body with ours, or rather is considered as the head with the members, we think that may suffice; and we need not desire any closer alliance, on this side heaven, than such an union amounts to.

3. To the Calvinists of the ancient stamp, (if any such remained now,) we might reply, that though we eat not Christ's glorified body in the Eucharist, yet we really receive it, while we receive it into closer mystical union than before: and, though we know nothing of the diffusion of any virtue of Christ's flesh, (which would not profit,) yet we have the power and presence of his Godhead with us, and, at the same time, a virtual or mystical union with his body, sufficient to make us, in Divine construction and Divine acceptance, one with him: 'For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones [q].'

4. To the Zuinglian Sacramentarians, old Anabaptists, Socinians, and Remonstrants, who will not admit of any medium between local corporal presence, and no presence at all as to beneficial effects, no medium between the natural body itself, and mere signs and figures; to them we rejoin, that there is no necessity of falling in with either extreme; because there is a medium, a very just one, and where indeed the truth lies. For though there is no corporal presence, yet there is a spiritual one, exhibitive of Divine blessings and graces: and though we eat not Christ's natural glorified body in the Sacrament, or out of it, yet our mystical union with that very body is strengthened and perfected in and through the Sacrament, by the operation of the Holy Spirit. This appears to be both sense and truth; and shall be more largely made out in the sequel.

[q] Ephes. v. 30.

5. To those who admit not that the natural body of Christ is in any sense received at all, but imagine that the elements, as impregnated or animated with the Spirit, are the only body received, and are made our Lord's body by such union with the Spirit[r]; I say, to those we make answer, that the union of the Spirit with the elements (rather than with the persons) appears to be a gross notion, and groundless: and if it were admitted, yet could it not make the elements, in any just sense, our Lord's body, but the notion would resolve into a kind of impanation of the Spirit, for the time. Besides that the consequence would be, that the Lord's body is received by all communicants, worthy or unworthy[s], which is not the truth of the case. Wherefore to avoid all such needless suppositions and needless perplexities, let us be content to teach only this plain doctrine; that we eat Christ crucified in this Sacrament, as we partake of the merits of his death: and if we thus have part in his crucified body, we are thereby ipso facto made partakers of the body glorified; that is, we receive our Lord's body into a closer union than before, and become his members by repeated and stronger ties; provided we come worthily to the holy table, and that there is no just obstacle, on our part, to stop the current of Divine graces.

I may shut up this account with the excellent words of Archbishop Cranmer, as follows, only put into the modern spelling:

'The first Catholic Christian faith is most plain, clear, and comfortable, without any difficulty, scruple, or doubt: that is to say, that our Saviour Christ, although he be sitting in heaven,

[r] This seems to be Mr. Johnson's notion, in the Unbloody Sacrifice, &c. part i. p. 247. And it is very near akin, so far, to that of the modern Greek Church, as represented by Mr. Claude in his Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, part i. book iii. c. 13. p. 218.

[s] If the elements are supposed to be united to, or enriched with the Spirit, all that receive must of course receive the Spirit, and be sanctified by him. For the presence of the Spirit, in this case, is not to be understood merely of the essential presence extending equally to all creatures, but of a gracious presence: and if such gracious presence is vouchsafed to the unworthy as well as worthy, then the benefits must be common to all, and none can eat and drink their own damnation. The fundamental error of this hypothesis, (as also of the Lutheran and the Romish,) is the connecting the grace of the Sacrament with the elements, instead of looking for it in the persons only.

in equality with his Father, is our life, strength, food, and sustenance; who by his death delivered us from death, and daily nourishes and increases us to eternal life. And in token hereof, he hath prepared bread to be eaten, and wine to be drunk of us in his holy Supper, to put us in remembrance of his said death, and of the celestial feeding, nourishing, increasing, and of all the benefits which we have thereby: which benefits, through faith and the Holy Ghost, are exhibited and given unto all that worthily receive the said holy Supper. This the husbandman at his plough, the weaver at his loom, and the wife at her rock, can remember, and give thanks unto God for the same: this is the very doctrine of the Gospel, with the consent wholly of all the old ecclesiastical doctors [t].'

My readers, I hope, will excuse it, if in the course of this chapter I have been obliged sometimes to suppose some things, which are hereafter to be proved: I could not avoid it, without rendering the whole intricate and obscure. What relates to spiritual graces in particular, as conveyed in the Eucharist, shall be distinctly considered in its place, and the proofs produced at large: but there was no explaining what sacramental or symbolical feeding means, (which was the design of this chapter,) without taking some previous and general notice of the spiritual graces, which are the food conveyed from heaven, by and under the symbols of bread and wine in the Eucharist.

CHAP. VIII.

1 Cor. x. 16, &c. *explained, and vindicated from Misconstructions.*

ST. PAUL'S doctrine concerning the Eucharist, in the tenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, though but occasionally delivered, will yet deserve a distinct chapter by itself, as it is of great moment, and much depends upon a true and faithful construction of it. It will be proper, in the first place, to produce the whole passage, but correctly rendered, as near as may be to the Greek original.

Verse 16. ' The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a

[t] Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 396. first edit.

communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?

17. For since the bread is one, we, being many, are one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.

18. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they who eat of the sacrifices communicants of the altar?

19. What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that what is offered in sacrifice to the idol is anything?

20. But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not have you become communicants of devils.

21. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.

I have varied a little from the common rendering, partly for better answering the difference of phrase in the Greek, between *μετέχειν* and *κοινωνεῖν*, (be they equivalent or otherwise [u],) and partly for the better expressing the three communions, here brought in as corresponding to each other in the analogy; namely, that of Christ's body and blood in the first place, next, that of the Jewish altar, and lastly, of devils. Our translation has, in some measure, obscured the analogy, by choosing, in one place, the word partakers (though it means the same thing) instead of communicants, and in another place, by saying communion *with* devils, instead of saying *of* devils: *κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων*, v. 20. I use the phrase 'communicants of' to express the participating in common of anything: which perhaps is not altogether agreeable to the strict propriety of the English idiom. But I could not think of anything better, that would answer the purpose in other respects; and since I have now intimated what I mean by it, the phrase, I suppose, may be borne with. But let us come to the business in hand.

[u] In strictness, *μετέχειν* signifies the taking a part or parcel of anything, with others, who have likewise their separate shares or parcels of it: but *κοινωνεῖν* is the partaking with others, 'in commune,' of the same whole, undivided thing. Notwithstanding, the words are sometimes used promiscuously. Chrysostom, upon the place, takes notice of the distinction, and makes his use of it, for explaining the text, and doing justice to the subject.

Before we can make a just use of St. Paul's doctrine in this place, as concerning the holy Communion, it will be necessary to understand the argument which he was then upon, with the occasion of it. The Christians of Corinth, to whom the Apostle writes, were encompassed with Pagan idolaters, and were in great danger of being insidiously drawn in, by specious pretences, to eat of meats which had been offered up, in the way of sacrifice, to their idols. Such eating (if Christians were aware that the meat had been so offered) was, in just construction, participating in common with the Pagan idolaters, of devils, to whom those idols or statues belonged. Whereupon St. Paul exhorts his new converts to beware of such dangerous practice, reminding them of the grievous judgments of God, which formerly came upon their forefathers the Israelites, for the sin of idolatry. 'Neither be ye idolaters,' says he, 'as were some of them[w]:' and a little lower, 'Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry[x].' But because they seemed not yet fully sensible that such practice of theirs was really idolatry, but they had several artificial evasions to shift off the charge, (as, that an idol was nothing in itself, and that they had no design by eating of such meats to signify any consent of theirs with idolaters, or to give any countenance to them,) I say, because the new converts were not readily convinced of the sin and danger of such practice, the Apostle undertakes to argue the case with them, in a very friendly, but strong and pressing manner, both upon Jewish and Christian principles, prefacing what he had to urge with this handsome compliment to them: 'I speak as to wise men,' (I appeal to your own good sense and sagacity,) 'judge ye what I say[y].' Then he proceeds to argue in the way of parallel, or by parity of reason, from the case of the Christian Eucharist, and the Jewish feasts upon peace-offerings, in order to infer from both, that as the Eucharist is interpretatively a participating of Christ's body and blood, and as the Jewish feasts were participating of the altar; so the eating of idol-meats was interpretatively a participating of devils. To take the Apostle's argument in its just and full view, we must consider him as bearing in mind

[w] 1 Cor. x. 7. [x] 1 Cor. x. 14. [y] 1 Cor. x. 15.

two distinct things which he had upon his hands to prove by one and the same argument: the first was, that eating of the idol-sacrifices (knowingly) was interpretatively consenting with the idolaters, or communicating with them, though they might mean nothing less; and the second was, that such consenting with the idolaters was interpretatively, or in effect, participating of devils. Such being the case, it could not but appear to be of very dangerous consequence, knowingly to eat of things offered to idols.

From this view of the Apostle's argument, I pass on to consider what we may hence infer with respect to his doctrine of the Eucharist, thus occasionally delivered as the true and well-known doctrine of Christ. His account of it is briefly expressed, in its being a communion of Christ's body and blood; that is to say, of the body considered as broken, and of the blood considered as shed; as is very plain from the terms of the institution: and it is not improbable that the Apostle here so distinctly mentioned both, to intimate that they were to be considered as divided and separate, which was the case at his crucifixion, and not after. By communion, the Apostle certainly intended a joint communion, or participating in common with others, as appears by the words immediately following; 'We being many are one body,' &c. Besides that his argument required it, as I have already hinted. For he was to convince the Corinthians, to whom he wrote, that eating of idol-meats was interpretatively consenting with idolaters, and of consequence partaking in common with them, of what they were supposed to partake of. And I presume, that it was with this particular view, and to make out his whole argument, consisting of two main points, that the Apostle threw in the words of verse the 17th. So then, we may thus far construe the Apostle's doctrine of the Eucharist to mean, that Christians feeding upon the consecrated symbols, in due manner, are supposed therein to be joint partakers of, or communicants in, Christ's body and blood, whatever that means, and also to be mystically united with each other. Now we come to the main point of all, namely, what that partaking, or that communion, of our Lord's body and blood strictly or precisely signifies. Moderns have been

strangely divided about it, (though it was anciently a very plain thing,) and perhaps it may be thought a piece of respect due to them, to mention their several interpretations, though we must reject all but one, as late devices, and more or less foreign to the Apostle's argument.

1. To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, under the forms, accidents, or appearances of bread and wine, is manifestly a forced and late interpretation; not heard of for eight hundred years or more, and, besides, absurd, contradictory, and impossible. If we may trust to our reason or to our senses, (and if we may not, what is there that we can trust to?) the bread and wine do remain, after consecration, the same in substance as before, changed only as to their uses, relations, or offices. Besides, Christ's body broken and blood shed 1700 years ago, are no more in that capacity, nor ever will be; and therefore it is absolutely impossible that they should be literally present in the Sacrament, or made food to the communicants. To all which may be added, that the elements, after consecration, are still expressly called bread and wine in this very place, and therefore supposed to be what they are called.

2. To say that the communion of our Lord's body and blood means the receiving his natural flesh and blood into our mouths, together with the symbols, would be running into the like absurdities with the former. Christ's body as crucified, and blood as spilled, are no more: his body glorified is as far distant as heaven and earth, and therefore not present in the Sacrament; or if it were, could not properly be eaten, nor be of use if it could, since the 'flesh profiteth nothing.' Besides, the text speaks not of two bodies, or bloods, as present in the Sacrament. The symbolical body and blood (bread and wine) are there present: the rest is present only in a figure, or under certain construction. A mystical union of Christ's glorified body with our bodies is indeed intimated in the text, or may, by just consequence, be inferred from it; but the direct doctrine of the text relates only to the body as crucified, and to the blood as shed: and therefore here the proper distinctions should be made between the eating Christ's dead body,

and the uniting with his living body, (as above[z],) as also between the express doctrine of the text, and the consequences deducible from it by the help of reason, and of other texts compared.

3. To say that the communion here signifies the eating Christ's glorified body by faith, or with the mind, is not a just interpretation: because whatever is corporeal cannot be literally the food of the soul; as also because what is represented and eaten in the Sacrament is not the body glorified, but the body crucified and blood shed, which are no more, and which therefore cannot be received either with mouth or mind, excepting only in a qualified and figurative sense. A mystical union indeed (as before said) with Christ's glorified body is strengthened or perfected in the Eucharist: though that is a doctrine rather insinuated, than expressed here: while certainly collected both from the nature of the thing, and from divers other texts of the New Testament.

The three constructions hitherto mentioned have been all owing to too strict and servile an adherence to the letter, without reason, and against reason, and not countenanced by the ancients rightly understood. There are some other constructions which are faulty in the contrary extreme, receding too far from the letter, and degrading the Sacrament into a kind of empty or fruitless ceremony. There is the less excuse for so doing, considering how highly the Apostle speaks of the Sacrament, both in this and the next chapter: for though necessity will justify our receding from the letter, as far as such necessity extends, yet reason requires that we adhere to it as closely as we may, and extremes are always bad. But I proceed to take notice of some misconstructions in this way of under-commenting.

4. Some interpret communion here to mean no more than a joint partaking of the outward signs, symbols, or memorials of Christ's body and blood. But St. Paul must undoubtedly mean a great deal more, by his emphatical expressions; and his argument also requires it, as shall be shewn in due place. He does not say, that the Service is a commemoration of Christ's body and blood, but a partaking or communion of them[a]. So likewise,

[z] See above, p. 167, &c.

[a] 'S. Apostolus refragatur penitus glossae Socini, quandoquidem panem et poculum eucharisticum dicat esse

with respect to the Jews, he does not say that they commemorated the altar, but they were partakers of the altar: and the idolaters whom he speaks of did not barely commemorate devils, (if they did it at all,) but they were partakers of devils. Besides, to interpret the communion of a joint partaking of the symbols, or memorials, is inventing a sense too flat and jejune to be fathered upon the Apostle; for indeed it is mere tautology. It is no more than saying, that partaking of the bread and wine is partaking of the bread and wine. There is good sense in saying, that the partaking of one thing is, in just construction, the partaking of some other thing: but to make all sign, and nothing signified, or to reckon the outward signs twice over, dropping the inward things signified, is unsuitable to the turn of the whole passage, and entirely defeats the Apostle's argument. The eating of the sacrifices was not again mere eating of sacrifices, but it was, by interpretation, communicating with idolaters: and communicating with idolaters was not again communicating with idolaters, but it was, in just construction, partaking of devils[b]. Thus we find strong and admirable sense in the Apostle's discourse: but in the other way all is dull and insipid. Take we the next parallel instance: the joint partaking of the Jewish sacrifices was not again the joint partaking of the same sacrifices; but it was partaking of the altar, whatever that means: in like manner, a joint partaking of the symbols or memorials of bread and wine is not again a joint partaking of the same symbols or memorials, but of something else (by the Apostle's argument) which they represent, and call to our mind, and which in just construction, or in effect, they are. Had St. Paul meant only, that the bread which we break is the joint eating of the bread, and the cup which we bless is the joint

communicationem corporis et sanguinis Christi. Ubi subjecti loco, .. panem et poculum benedictionis constituit, in praedicato vero, non commemorationem, aut memoriale corporis aut sanguinis Christi, sed communicationem ejusdem ponit.' Calovius de Eucharist. p. 279.

[b] The commentaries under the name of Jerome, supposed to be Pelagius's, well express the sense of the Apostle:

'Panis idololatriae daemonum participatio esse monstratur; ... si cum idololatris de uno pane comedimus, unum cum illis corpus efficimur. .. Non potestis et Dei et daemonum esse participes.' Hieronym. Opp. tom. v. p. 995, ed. Bened.

drinking of the cup, why should he have changed the terms bread and cup into other terms, body and blood, instead of using the same over again? Or if body and blood mean only bread and cup, then see what sense can be made of Chap. xi. 27, which must run thus: Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the bread and cup of the Lord. It is not using an inspired Apostle with any proper respect, to put such an odd (not to say ridiculous) sense upon him. The case is plain, that the four terms, bread, wine, body, and blood, have severally their respective meanings, and that the two first express the signs, to which the other two answer as things signified, and so all is right. Add to this, that the eating and drinking in the Eucharist, upon the foot of the other construction, would be rendered insignificant: for the breaking of the bread, and the pouring out of the wine, would be sufficient for a bare representation or memorial of our Lord's death: the feeding thereupon adds nothing to the representation, but must either signify our receiving something spiritual under that corporeal symbol, or signify nothing. And it would appear very strange, if the feeding itself should not be symbolical, some way or other, as well as the rest; especially considering that other places of Scripture (particularly John vi.) do insist very much upon spiritual feeding, and that the quantity of meat and drink in the Eucharist has all along been so small, that it might be difficult to say what use it could be of as a banquet, unless allowed to be significative or symbolical of some spiritual entertainment received by the communicants [c]. Upon the whole, this fourth interpretation must be rejected, as being altogether low and lame, or rather totally repugnant to all the circumstances of text and context.

5. Others therefore, perceiving that there must be both a sign and a thing signified, (or in other words, a corporal manducation, and a spiritual one also,) and yet being unwilling to admit of any present benefits in the Eucharist, have contrived this turn,

[c] Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οὔτε πολὺ λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον, ἵνα γνῶμεν ὅτι οὐκ εἰς πλησμονὴν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἁγιασμόν. Concil. Nicaen. in Gelas. Cyzicen. Labb. et Cossart. tom. ii. p. 234.

that the sacramental feeding shall signify spiritual feeding, yea, and spiritual communion with Christ, before, and in, and after the Sacrament, but that this spiritual feeding shall mean only the receiving Christ's doctrine and promises; or that the Eucharist shall not import anything then received, (more than at other times,) but shall be declarative only of what was received before, or is to be received then, or after. The design of all which is to evade any pretence of receiving graces from above, in or by this Sacrament: and this is the scheme which the Socinians commonly take into [d]. Yea, they sometimes scruple not to own, that under spiritual feeding is contained remission of sins, and present right to life eternal: but still they will not have it said, that God conveys or confers these benefits in or by the Sacrament, but that we in the Sacrament do declare and testify that we are partakers of those benefits [e], having brought them with us, not receiving them there, more than elsewhere.

But these fine-spun notions, being only the inventions of men, can never be able to stand against the truth of God. St. Paul does not say, that the Eucharist is a declaration of communion, but a communion: nor does he say, communion with Christ our

[d] 'Hinc vero patet usum panis et calicis non ideo Christi corporis et sanguinis communionem dici, quod per istum usum demum communio ista fiat; sed quod per eum communio ac societas ista, quae jam est, et esse debet, significetur et declaretur.' Crellius in loc. p. 307. Cp. Socin. Quod Re. Polon. p. 701.

'Hoc ritu testamur nos corpus Christi pro nobis crucifixum habere pro spirituali animae nostrae cibo, et sanguinem ejus fusum pro salutari potu, nosque communionem illius habere, et sic ad novum foedus pertinere, &c., quae omnia fidem per charitatem efficacem postulant.' Racov. Cat. p. 242.

'Panem illum edendo atque ex poculo bibendo palam testamur et profitemur nos corpus Christi fractum ac crucifixum pro animae cibo, sanguinem pro potu habere, quo ad vitam spiritualem et sempiternam proinde alamur et confirmemur, ac cibo potuque corpora nostra ad vitam terrenam et corporalem sustentantur: non quidem quod in hac tantum actione, Christi carnem et sanguinem spiritualiter edamus et bibamus . . . sed quod pia mortis Christi meditatione, et vera in eum fide id perficiatur, ac porro etiam extra hunc ritum a nobis fiat, quam diu meditatio illa ac fides inde concepta in animis nostris viget.' Volkelius, p. 310, alias 687. Cp. Schlicting. cont. Meisner. pp. 751, 788, 789.

[e] 'Hac ceremonia profitemur nos, ea qua dictum est ratione, corpus Christi edere, et sanguinem ejus bibere, et sic eorum bonorum quae morte sua cruenta Christus nobis peperit (h. e. remissionis peccatorum, et vitae sempiternae, quam spe certa in hoc saeculo veluti praecipimus) esse participes.' Volkelius, p. 312, alias 688.

head, (though that indeed is a remote consequence of the other,) but communion of the body and blood of Christ. In the parallel instances, eating of idol-meats was not a declaration of what had been done before, nor a declaration of what was to be done after, (perhaps it was the first time, and might be the last,) but that single action was taking part with idolaters, and that amounted to partaking of devils. It was so with respect to the Jewish sacrifices, the partaking of them was not merely declaring their participation of the altar, but it was actual participating at that very time, and by that very act. St. Paul's words are express, 'are partakers of the altar,' (not proclaimers of it,) and his argument requires that sense [f]. Had the Corinthians suspected that the Apostle was talking of declarations only, virtual declarations, they would soon have replied, that they were ready to declare to all the world, that they intended no such thing as communicating with idolaters, or of devils, by their eating of the idol-meats, and that such express counter-declarations would more than balance any other. But that would have been protestation against fact, and would have availed nothing: for St. Paul had plainly told them what the nature of the action was; viz. communicating with idolaters, and not only so, but partaking of devils. Therefore, by analogy and parity of reason, the nature of our eucharistical service is an actual partaking of the death of Christ with the fruits thereof.

If there were need of any further arguing in so plain a case, I might add, that such kind of declaring as they speak of, (declaring their spiritual eating,) appears not so modest, or so reverent, as one might wish, if we consider what they mean by spiritual meat. They commonly intend by it the whole faith and practice of a Christian, together with pardon of sins and a right to life eternal consequent upon it. So then, their coming to the Lord's table to declare their spiritual feeding, what is it but proclaiming, before God and man, how righteous, how holy, and how perfect they are, and what claims they make on that score: which would be much more like to the boasting of a Pharisee, than to the

[f] Compare Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, in answer to the same pretence about declaring, &c. part i. p. 172, alias 175, &c.

proper penitent behaviour of an humble Christian, appearing before God. It may be thought, perhaps, that such declarations are of great use, because men will be cautious of telling a solemn lie in the presence of God, and will of course take care to be as good as they declare themselves to be[g]. But it might be rather suspected, and the effect would be quite contrary, and such a method of ostentation would be much more likely to harden men in their sins.

However, to soften the matter, they sometimes so explain this their declaration, as to amount only to a good resolution, or promise, for the time to come, or a protestation that they look upon a good life as the proper food of their souls. This indeed is more modest, but then it is going still further off from the text of St. Paul than before: for, in this view, the receiving the Sacrament is neither eating anything spiritual, nor so much as a declaration of eating, but it is a declaration only of their own judgment concerning it. Let them therefore turn this matter which way they please, they will never come up to the true meaning or force of St. Paul's words. In the meanwhile, we readily accept, what they are pleased to allow, that pardon of sins, and present right to life eternal, ought to be looked upon as part of the spiritual food: and we think it decent and modest, as well as just, to believe, that we receive our spiritual food at the altar, from the hands of Christ, and do not bring it thither ourselves; especially considering that Christ himself delivered the corporal food to the disciples, which was the symbol of spiritual. And though we ought to take care to come properly qualified to the holy Communion, yet we come not to declare how rich we were before, but to deplore our poverty, and to beg fresh relief, and new supplies, from above.

6. Some think it sufficient to say, that the Eucharist imports our holding communion or fellowship with Christ our head. But this interpretation is low and insufficient, expressing a truth, but

[g] 'Ideo simul etiam cogitandum est tibi, ut talis sis qualem te in hoc ritu profiteris; nec Deo et Christo mentiaris. Quod si talis nondum sis, id saltem omnino constituendum, ut talis quam primum evadas, nec committendum ut irritum postea sit hoc animi tui decretum.' Racov. Cat. pp. 242, 243.

not the whole truth. The Apostle's expression is very strong, communion of, not communion with, and of Christ's body and blood, not simply of Christ. So in the parallel instances: they that ate of the idol-meats held communion indeed with the idolaters, but were partakers of devils, not with devils: and they that ate of the Jewish sacrifices were partakers of the altar. Therefore Bishop Patrick well says, with regard to the word communion in this place, 'In its full signification it denotes, not merely our being made of his (Christ's) society, but our having a communication of his body and blood to us: so the word κοινωνέω is rendered, Gal. vi. 6, Phil. iv. 15 [h].' In short, the communion here spoken of must either mean merely the outward profession of Christianity, and then it is an interpretation much too low, and is liable to most of the objections with that of the preceding article; or else it means a vital union with Christ, as his living members, and then it implies partaking in his death, resurrection, &c., and coincides with the common construction. The greatest fault therefore of this interpretation is, that it is loose, general, equivocal; no explication of the text, because not determinate, but darker than the text itself, and therefore fitted only to disguise and perplex the Apostle's meaning, and to deceive an unwary reader.

7. Having considered, and, as I conceive, confuted the several wrong constructions of St. Paul's words, it is now time to return to the true, easy, natural, and ancient [i] interpretation, before hinted, and now to be more largely enforced or confirmed. The Eucharist in its primary intention, and in its certain effect to all worthy communicants, is a communion of Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is to say, a present partaking of, or having a part in our Lord's passion, and the reconcilement therein made, and the blessed fruits of it. This is plain good sense, and undeniable truth. 'The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received of the faithful: that is, they have a real part and portion given them in the death and sufferings of the Lord Jesus, whose body was broken and blood shed for the remission

[h] Bishop Patrick's Christian Sacrifice, p. 52.
[i] See above, pp. 99, 101, 143.

of sins. They truly and indeed partake of the virtue of his bloody sacrifice, whereby he hath obtained eternal redemption for us[k].' It is observable that St. Paul, (his own best interpreter,) instead of saying, Ye do shew the Lord's body and blood, broken and shed, says, 'Ye do shew the Lord's death till he come[l].' Which makes it plain, that 'body broken and blood shed' are, in this case, equivalent to the single word 'death' with its fruits; and that is the thing signified in our sacramental service. And if that be the thing signified, it is that which we partake of, or spiritually receive: and we are in this Sacrament ingrafted, as it were, into the death of Christ, in much the same sense, and to the same effect, as in the other Sacrament we are said to be 'baptized into his death[m],' and 'planted together in the likeness of his death[n].' All the difference is that the same thing is represented and exhibited, here and there, under different signs or symbols. There we have our right and title to the merits and benefits of his passion delivered to us under the symbol of water inclosing us, as a grave incloses a dead body; here we have the same right and title again delivered under the symbols of bread and wine[o], received by us, and incorporated with us. But of the analogy of the two Sacraments, I have spoken before[p], and need not repeat. Only let it be remembered, that Baptism does not only represent our Lord's death, burial, and resurrection, but exhibits them likewise in their fruits and virtue, and makes the baptized party, if fitly qualified, partaker of them. And as there undoubtedly is a near correspondence and analogy between the two Sacraments, in their general nature, ends, and uses, we may justly argue from one Sacrament to the other; and the argument carries in it, if not the force of demonstration, yet very considerable weight. There is this further use in it, that it furnishes us with a clear and full answer to the objections made against the supposition of such and such privileges being conferred by or annexed to a single act of religion: for if they are

[k] Bishop Patrick's Christian Sacrifice, p. 53.

[l] 1 Cor. xi. 26.

[m] Rom. vi. 3.

[n] Rom. vi. 5.

[o] Τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας—δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς τῷ Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεότητος. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. iii. p. 70.

[p] See above, ch. vii. p. 138.

annexed to or conferred by Baptism, a single act of religion, why may they not by the Eucharist also, though a single act? Such objections either strike at both Sacraments, or can really hurt neither: or if it be allowed (as indeed it must) that Baptism, notwithstanding, has such privileges annexed to it, by the express words of Scripture, it must be allowed that the Eucharist, at least, may have the same. If, for instance, remission of sins, sanctification of the Spirit, mystical union with Christ, present right to a resurrection and life eternal, are (as they certainly are) conferred in and by Baptism, to persons fitly qualified; it is in vain to object, in the case of the Eucharist, that those privileges cannot be annexed to or conferred by a single act.

But let us return to our positive proofs, that such blessings are annexed to a due receiving of the Holy Communion. This passage of St. Paul, rightly considered, is a demonstration of it, as I have already intimated. The Socinians themselves, as I have before observed, are obliged to allow, that spiritual manducation carries with it present remission of sins, and present right to everlasting life: and they are pleased to allow further, that in the Sacrament (though they will not say, by the Sacrament) there may be, or often is, spiritual manducation. Indeed, Smalcius seems to hesitate a little upon it, or comes with great reluctance to it; but after all is forced to submit to so glaring a truth. First, he pretends, that we are so far from feeding spiritually upon Christ in the Eucharist, that we must have done it before, or we are not worthy to come at all [q]. Well: why may we not have done it before, and now much more so? He is pleased, soon after, to allow, that spiritual manducation is a kind of constant perpetual act, or habit, supposed in every good Christian, in the whole course of his life, and in all his actions [r].

[q] 'Dicimus tantum abesse, ut in coena Domini corpus Christi comedatur, et sanguis ejus bibatur, ut qui antea Christi corpus spiritualiter non manducaverit, manducatione hac panis carnali plane indignus sit.' Smalc. contr. Frantz. p. 336.

[r] 'Ut manducatio spiritualis corporis, et bibitio sanguinis Christi est aliquid perpetuum, quod in nobis inesse debet, sic in omnibus vitae nostrae factis considerari poterit et debet.' Smalc. ibid. p. 340.

Why then not in the sacramental action? At length, he allows it, with some reluctance, even in that also[s]; as he could not avoid it by his own principles.

Thus far then we are advanced, even upon the concessions of adversaries, that there may be (or that there certainly is, to pious and good Christians) a spiritual feeding in the Eucharist, and that such spiritual feeding carries in it present remission, and present right to life eternal[t]. Where then do we differ? Perhaps here; that we say, by the Sacrament, and they, in the Sacrament, like as in all other good offices. But we do not say, that the Sacrament does it by its own virtue: no, it is God only that grants remission, or spiritual rights, whether in the Sacrament or out of it; and while we assert that he does it in and by the Eucharist, we do not presume to say, or think, that he does it not in Baptism also, or in other religious services. What then is the point of controversy still remaining? It appears to be this principally, that we assert the very act of communion (in persons fitly disposed) to be spiritual manducation; a present receiving of spiritual blessings and privileges, additional to what was before: this they deny, alleging that there are no special benefits annexed to the Eucharist[u] as such, nothing more conferred

[s] 'Quia spiritualis manducatio corporis Christi perpetuum aliquid est, dici quidem potest, tunc etiam illam fieri, cum coena Domini celebratur.' Smalc. ibid. p. 340.

Schlictingius carries it higher, or expresses it stronger, though indeed he afterwards goes off into the declarative notion, seeming to prefer it.

'Quid igitur est, inquies, Christi corporis proprie *κοινωνία*? Commune jus est, (ut ipsa vox indicat) Christi corporis pro nobis fracti, et sic bonorum inde manantium. Sacrum igitur panem qui frangunt et comedunt, modo digne id faciant, bonorum istorum participes fiunt; ut hoc sensu sacri panis fractio, et comestio corporis Christi, communio dicatur per metonymiam effecti; quod scilicet communionis istius causa sit et medium: quippe Christi praeceptorum officiique nostri pars non postrema; uti qui id facere negligat, non plus juris habeat in Christi corpore, quam Petrus habiturus erat communionis cum Christo, si pedes sibi lavare volenti praefracte restitisset.' Schlicting. contr. Meis. p. 750.

[t] See Volkelius above, p. 183.

[u] 'Christiani quia mortem Christi commemorant, et pro ea gratias agunt, non praesens beneficium requirunt,' &c. Smalcius, p. 333.

'Nequaquam in eum finem hic ritus est institutus, ut aliquid ex eo reportemus, sed ut jam antea acceptum beneficium commemoremus.' Volkelius de Vera Relig. p. 313, alias 691. 'Non in hunc finem coenam Dominicam constitutam esse, ut ex ejus usu aliquem fructum reportemus.' Volkelius, ibid. p. 684.

than what is constantly conferred to good men, at all other times, and in all other good offices, or common duties[x]. Now, in defence of our doctrine, we plead St. Paul's authority, who asserts, that the Eucharist is actually a communion of Christ's body and blood: let them shew, that any common service, or any other service, office, or duty, (except Baptism,) is so; and then they will come close to the point. It hath been observed above, that eating of idol-meats, knowingly, was ipso facto communicating with idolaters, and that communicating with idolaters was ipso facto partaking of devils, and that the eating of the Jewish sacrifices was ipso facto partaking of the altar: therefore also receiving the holy Communion, fit dispositions always supposed, is ipso facto, (in that very act, and at that present time, by that act) partaking of the death of Christ, with the fruits or privileges of it. Since therefore the very nature of the act supposes it and implies it, (which is more than the nature of every other act, service, or duty does,) therefore there is some peculiar force, virtue, and efficacy annexed to the Eucharist, above what is ordinarily annexed to common duties. Duties, as such, are conditions only on our part, applications of men to God, and therefore are not properly instruments in the hand of God for conveying his graces: but sacraments are applications of God to men, and therefore are properly his instruments of conveyance, his appointed means or conduits, in and by which he confers his graces. Gospel duties are the conditional causes of spiritual blessings, while Sacraments are properly the instrumental conveyances. Neither repentance, nor faith, nor even sacraments, considered merely as duties, or as acts of ours, are properly channels of grace, being, as I said, conditions only: but sacraments considered as applications of God to men are properly channels

[x] 'Negat Socinus hunc ritum proprie institutum esse ad nostram aliquam singularem utilitatem in negotio salutis. Proprie inquam, nam alioquin libenter concedimus, hujus ritus observationem non minus ad salutem conferre quam reliquorum praeceptorum executionem: verum haec utilitas et generalis est, et non illius causa proprie ritus hic institutus est.' Schlicting. contr. Meisner. p. 791; cp. 795.

'Libenter admittimus ritus istius observationem inter bona opera numerandam, et cum illis conjungendam esse.' Schlicting. ibid. p. 798.

of spiritual benefits. This is a distinction which ought carefully to be heeded, for the right understanding of the difference between sacraments and duties [y].

Preaching of the word is most like to sacraments in the instrumental capacity; for by the word also God conveys his graces. But still inviting, exhorting, or calling men to be reconciled to God, comes not up to signing and sealing the reconciliation: neither is preparing men for the covenant the same thing with covenanting. The Eucharist, as hath been noted, is an actual communion, wherein God gives and man receives at that instant, or in the very act. Such being the nature and use of this eucharistical service, in Divine construction, and by Divine appointment, it is manifest from thence, that it carries in it the force of a promise, or contract [z], on God's part, that, fit qualifications supposed on our part, this service shall never fail of its effect, but shall be to every worthy receiver like a deed of conveyance, instrumentally investing him with the benefits of Christ's death, for the time being; and to the end also, if he perseveres to the end. 'It is no good argument to say, the graces of God are given to believers out of the Sacrament, ergo, not by or in the Sacrament: but rather thus; if God's grace overflows sometimes, and goes without his own instruments, much more shall he give it in the use of them. If God gives pardon without the Sacrament, then rather also with the Sacrament. For supposing the Sacraments, in their design and institution, to be nothing but signs and ceremonies, yet they cannot hinder the work of God: and therefore holiness in the reception of them will do more than holiness alone; for God does nothing in vain. The

[y] See above, p. 11, &c.

[z] 'Verbum Dei quidem comitatur etiam aliqua Spiritus Dei efficacia... Verum efficacia ista a Deo prorsus libere dispensatur, et absque ullo pacto et promissione Dei, qua Deus ad hos et illos, potius quam alios, ejusmodi gratia donandos, sese obstrinxerit. Cum Sacramentis autem, ex Dei pacto, conjuncta est vis quaedam divini Spiritus, per quam agunt infallibiliter in omnibus iis quibus debite administrantur, quique illa suscipiunt cum ea quam Deus in iis praerequirit dispositione... Ex nullo pacto tenetur Deus verbum virtute sui Spiritus comitari: sacramentis autem ex certa Dei pactione, adest virtus divina, per quam gratiam quandam salutarem communicant omnibus illis qui secundum ordinem a Deo positum illa participant.' Le Blanc, Thes. p. 676.

Sacraments do something in the hand of God: at least, they are God's proper and accustomed time of grace: they are his seasons and our opportunity [a].'

And now if any one should ask for a catalogue of those spiritual privileges, which St. Paul in this place has omitted, our Lord himself may supply that omission by what he has said in John vi. For, since we have proved, that there is a spiritual manducation in the Eucharist, with all worthy receivers, it now follows, of course, that what our Lord says in John vi. of spiritual manducation in the general, is all strictly applicable to this particular manner of spiritual feeding; and is the best explication we can any where have of what it includes or contains. It contains, 1. A title to a happy resurrection: for such as spiritually feed on Christ, Christ will 'raise up at the last day [b].' 2. A title to eternal life: for our Lord expressly says, 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life [c].' 3. A mystical union with Christ in his whole Person; or, more particularly, a presential union with him in his Divine nature: 'He that eateth my flesh, &c. dwelleth in me, and I in him [d].' 4. In these are implied (though not directly expressed by our Lord in that discourse) remission of sins, and sanctification of the Holy Spirit; of which I may say more in a proper place.

To return to St. Paul's text, I shall here sum up the true and the full sense of it, mostly in Mr. Locke's words [e], with some few and slight alterations. 'They who drink of the cup of blessing, which we bless in the Lord's Supper, do they not thereby partake of the benefits purchased by Christ's blood shed for them upon the cross, which they here symbolically drink? and they who eat of the bread broken there, do they not partake in the sacrifice of the body of Christ, and strengthen their union with him, as members of him their head? For by eating of that bread, we, though many in number, are all united, and make but one body under Christ our head, as many grains of corn

[a] Bishop Taylor's Worthy Communicant, p. 38.
[b] John vi. 54.
[c] John vi. 51, 54, 58.
[d] John vi. 56, 57.
[e] Locke's Commentary on the Text, p. 181.

are united into one loaf. See how it is among the Jews, who are outwardly, according to the flesh, by circumcision the people of God. Among them, they who eat of the sacrifice are partakers of God's table, the altar, have fellowship with him, and share in the benefit of the sacrifice, as if it were offered for them[f]. Do not mistake me, as if I hereby said, that the idols of the Gentiles are gods in reality, or that the things offered to them change their nature, and are anything really different from what they were before, so as to affect us in our use of them: no, but this I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God, and I would not that you should have fellowship with, and be under the influence of devils, as they who, by eating of things offered to them, enter into covenant, alliance, and commerce with them. You cannot eat and drink with God, as friends at his table in the Eucharist, and entertain familiarity and friendship with devils, by eating with them, and partaking of the sacrifices offered to them.' Such appears to be the force of the whole argument. But as there is nothing so plain, but that it may be obscured by misconception, and darkened by artificial colourings, so we need not wonder if difficulties have been raised against the construction here given. And because it may sometimes happen, that very slight pretences on one side, if not particularly answered, may weigh more with some persons, than the strongest reasons on the other, I shall here be at the pains to bring together such objections as I have anywhere met with, and to consider them one by one.

[f] Dr. Pelling, in his Discourse of the Sacrament, (pp. 116, 117, 118,) well illustrates the case of the Jews, as partaking of the altar. I shall cite a small part:—'There is an expression which will make this matter clear, in Levit. vii. 18, "neither shall it be imputed," &c. When those sacrificial feasts were regularly celebrated, they were imputed to the guests for their good, they were reckoned advantageous to them, they were favourably accepted at God's hand, in order to the ends for which the sacrifice was designed: they served to make an atonement, they were effectual to their purposes, they were good to all intents, they were available to the offerers, (as the Hebrew Doctors expound the phrase). This is the true meaning of being partakers of the altar,' &c. p. 117. In the next page the learned author applies the whole very aptly to the Eucharist.

Objections answered.

I. Dr. Whitby, whose comments upon this text, I am sorry to say, appear to be little else than laboured confusion, is pleased to object as here follows: 'Neither can the sense of the words be to this effect; The cup and bread communicate to us the spiritual effects of Christ's broken body, or his blood shed for us, though this be in itself a certain truth; for these spiritual effects cannot be shared among believers, so that every one shall have a part of them only, but the same benefits are wholly communicated to every due receiver. See note on ver. 16[g].' The learned author did well to call our doctrine a certain truth: but he had done better, if he had taken due care to preserve to this text that true sense, upon which chiefly that certain truth is founded. His objection against the spiritual effect being shared, appears to be of no weight: for how do we say they are shared? We do not say that Christ's death is divided into parcels, or is more than one death, or that his sacrifice is more than one sacrifice, or that it is shared like a loaf broken into parts, as the objection supposes: but the many sharers all partake of, and communicate in one undivided thing, the same death, the same sacrifice, the same atonement, the same Saviour, the same God and Lord: and here is no dividing or sharing anything, but as the same common blessing diffuses itself among many divided persons. And what is there amiss or improper in this notion? The learned author himself is forced to allow[h], that *κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, communion of his Son[i], and *κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων*, communion of his sufferings[j], and *κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, communion with the Father and the Son[k], are all so many proper phrases, to express the communion of many in one and the same thing, where the effects are common to those many. And he might have added *κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, communion of the Holy Ghost[l], and *κοινωνία τοῦ μυστηρίου*, communion of the mystery[m], as two other parallel instances, wherein the same

[g] Whitby on verse 20, p. 175.
[h] Whitby, p. 173.
[i] 1 Cor. i. 9.
[j] Phil. iii. 10.
[k] 1 John i. 3.
[l] 2 Corinthians xiii. 14. Phil. ii. 1.
[m] Eph. iii. 9.

undivided blessings are supposed to be communicated to many, in such a sense as we suppose the undivided blessing, privilege, atonement of Christ's death to be vouchsafed to worthy communicants. And therefore there is no occasion for the low thought, that *κοινωνία* here, with respect to the Eucharist, must signify no more than the sharing out the consecrated bread and wine among the communicants: which is resolving all into sign, and dropping the thing signified; and is sinking the Apostle's admirable sense into jejune, insipid tautology; as I have before observed. The Socinians themselves deal more justly and ingenuously with St. Paul's text in this place; as may sufficiently appear by what I have quoted from them in this chapter.

II. The same learned man makes a further attempt to defeat the true sense of this passage, first, by interpreting the partaking of the altar, to mean only having communion with God, or owning him as that God from whom they had received mercies; and next, by interpreting the partaking of devils so as to exclude any spiritual influence from devils[n]. To all which I shall make answer in the excellent words of Bishop Burnet[o]: 'If the meaning of their being partakers with devils [he should have said of devils] imports only their joining themselves in acts of fellowship with idolaters, then the sin of this would have easily appeared, without such a reinforcing of the matter. . . .St. Paul seems to carry the argument further: . . .since those idols were the instruments, by which the devil kept the world in subjection to him, all such as did partake in their sacrifices might come under the effects of that magic, that might be exerted about their temples or sacrifices; . . .and might justly fear being brought into a partnership of those magical possessions or temptations that might be suffered to fall upon such Christians as should associate themselves in so detestable a service[p]. In the same sense it was

[n] See Whitby on the place, pp. 174, 175.

[o] Burnet on the 28th Article, p. 428.

[p] The true meaning of partaking of devils, or of coming under the influence of devils, is very aptly illustrated by the following lines of Tertullian: 'Nemo in castra hostium transit, nisi projectis armis suis, nisi destitutis signis et sacramentis principis sui, nisi pactus simul perire. . . Quale est enim de Ecclesia Dei, in diaboli ecclesiam

also said, that the Israelites were partakers of the altar. That is, that all of them who joined in the acts of that religion, such as the offering their peace-offerings, (for of those of that kind they might only eat,) all these were partakers of the altar: that is, of all the blessings of their religion, of all the expiations, the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, that were offered on the altar, for the sins of the whole congregation. . . .Thus it appears, that such as joined in the acts of idolatry became partakers of all that influence that devils might have over those sacrifices; and all that continued in the observances of the Mosaical law, had thereby a partnership in the expiations of the altar; so likewise all Christians who receive this Sacrament worthily, have by their so doing a share in that which is represented by it, the death of Christ, and the expiation and other benefits that follow it.'

I cannot too often repeat, that St. Paul is not here speaking of external profession, or of outwardly owning the true God, (which any hypocrite might do,) but of being real and living members, and of receiving vital spiritual influences from Christ; and his argument rests upon it[q]. The thing may perhaps be yet further illustrated from a similar argument, made use of by the Apostle in a resembling case. 'Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. What? know ye not that he who is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit[r].'

tendere? de caelo, quod aiunt, in coenum? . . . Cur ergo non hujusmodi etiam daemoniis penetrabiles fiant? nam et exemplum accidit, Domino teste, ejus mulieris quae theatrum adiit, et inde cum daemonio rediit. Itaque in exorcismo cum oneraretur immundus spiritus, quod ausus esset fidelem adgredi; constanter, Justissime quidem, inquit, feci, in meo enim inveni.' Tertullian. de Spectac. cap. xxv xxvi. p. 83.

[q] 'Loquitur Apostolus de ejusmodi communione corporis et sanguinis Domini, per quam unum corpus cum illo et inter nos sumus, . . . reprobi et infideles, omnesque ejusmodi, Spiritus Christi destituti, quamvis sumant et participent panem quem frangimus, et benedictionis calicem, . . . non fiunt unum corpus cum Christo et fidelibus, sicut ipse Apostolus docet, inquiens: Qui Spiritum Christi non habet, hic non est ejus. Rom. viii. 9. 2 Cor. vi.' Albertin. p. 225.

[r] 1 Cor. vi. 15, 16, 17. Compare 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16. N.B. The Apostle is plainly speaking, in all the three places, of Christians, considered as true and living members

Here we may observe, that the argument, in both cases, proceeds upon the supposition that the Christians whom the Apostle speaks to are true and living members of Christ[s], and of consequence actual partakers of all the spiritual benefits of such union: which union would be entirely broken, and all its privileges forfeited, by commencing a contrary union, either with devils in one case, or with harlots in the other. The Apostle is not speaking of Christians as barely contradicting their outward professions, or committing a logical absurdity, but of their acting inconsistently with their internal blessings or privileges. There was no natural impossibility of appearing as guests both at God's table and the table of devils; it was as easy to be done, as it was easy for men to be deceitful, false, and wicked: but the Apostle speaks of a real inconsistency in things; namely, such as lies in the being in league with God and the devil at the same time, and retaining the friendship and participation of both[t]. All which shews, that the communicants whom the Apostle speaks of, were supposed to be true members of Christ, and of the invisible Church, in that very action, and so of consequence, thereby receiving all such spiritual benefits as that membership implies.

III. It has been thought some objection to this notion of benefits, that men could not be supposed to receive benefits from devils; and therefore the analogy or parallel will not hold, if St. Paul be interpreted as admitting or asserting benefits in the Eucharist. In reply to which I observe, 1. That St. Paul does not particularly mention benefits, (though he supposes them all the time,) but draws both parts of his parallel in general terms, and terms corresponding: communion of Christ's body and blood

of the internal invisible Church, and not merely of the external and visible. 'Nec ergo dicendi sunt manducare corpus Christi, quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt; quia non possunt esse membra Christi, et membra meretricis.' Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. cap. 25.

[s] 'Corpus nostrum, (id est, caro quae cum sanctimonia perseverat, et munditia,) membra dixit esse Christi.' Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 6. p. 300.

[t] Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι, ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει· ἐπεὶ δίχα σωζομένων καὶ φθιμένων τροφαὶ . . . οὐκ εὔλογον τραπέζης δαιμονίων μεταλαμβάνειν, τοὺς θείας μετέχειν καὶ πνευματικῆς κατηξιωμένους τροφῆς. Clem. Alex. Paed. lib. ii. cap. 1. pp. 168, 169.

'Non potestis et Dei et daemonum esse participes.' Pseudo-Hieronym. in loc.

on one side, communion of devils on the other. There the parallel rests, and there it answers to the greatest exactness: for as on one hand there are supposed influences, influxes, impressions, communications from Christ, so on the other hand, there are likewise supposed influences, influxes, impressions, communications from devils. The parallel here drawn out by the Apostle goes no further, and therefore it is strictly just, regular, and elegant: but the nature of the thing speaks the rest, that the influxes must be of as contrary a kind, as Christ is opposite to Belial. 2. St. Paul certainly supposed benefits, and great ones, belonging to the Lord's table: otherwise his dissuasive against the table of devils had been very lame and insufficient. For undoubtedly there were benefits to be expected (temporal benefits) on the other side, or else there had been no temptation that way, nor any occasion for such earnestness as the Apostle uses in the case to dissuade them from it: and if the Apostle had not supposed some benefits, of the spiritual kind, to be annexed to the Eucharist, much superior to all temporal emoluments, there would have been but very little force in his whole dissuasive. To be short; the more beneficial we conceive the Sacrament to be, so much the stronger is the Apostle's argument for preferring the Lord's table before any other that was incompatible with it: and therefore the supposition of benefits in the Eucharist was by no means foreign to the point in view, or wide of his purpose, but quite the contrary. For what could be more pertinent to his design of warning Christians to have nothing to do with the table of devils, than the intimating to them that they would thereby forfeit all the benefits and privileges they expected from the table of the Lord? Upon this foot, and this only, there is force and poignancy in what he says; 'Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and the table of devils [u].'

IV. It may perhaps be objected further, that the Pagan

[u] 1 Cor. x. 21. 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29. If there were not great benefits on one hand, as there is great danger on the other, what encouragement could there be to receive at all? Who would run the dreadful risk of being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?

notion of their sacrificial feasts was no more than this, that their gods or demons might sometimes condescend to come and feast with them, and so those feasts imported some kind of society or alliance with demons, but nothing of influxes, communications, impressions, &c. To which I answer, that we are not here inquiring what the Pagans supposed, but how the Apostle interpreted their feastings of that kind. The Pagans believed in gods, (as they thought,) or good demons; but the Apostle interprets all of bad angels or devils. And it is further observable, that he speaks not of partaking with devils of such banquets, but of partaking, with idolaters, of devils. All the expressions made use of by the Apostle declare for this meaning. Κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος, is partaking of body, not with body. Κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, is partaking of blood, not with blood. Κοινωνία τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, is partaking of the altar, not with the altar. In like manner, κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων must mean partaking of devils, not with devils [v]. For, in truth, the communicants in the idol-sacrifices were joint partakers, with idolaters, of devils, as Christian communicants are joint partakers, with Christians, of Christ. Thus the analogy is duly preserved, and the comparison answers to the greatest exactness.

I may here briefly take notice, in passing, that what concerns the communion or participation of devils, has been very minutely examined among some learned Divines abroad, within these thirty years last past. Gottofr. Olearius, a learned Lutheran of Leipsic, opened the subject in a Dissertation on 1 Cor. x. 21, printed A.D. 1709; reprinted in 1712. The design was to explain the Pagan notion of the communion of their demons, and from thence to illustrate the communion of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, as taught by the Apostle. Some years after, another learned Lutheran, in a treatise written in

[v] An ancient writer, of the third century, well expresses this matter: 'Quantum enim ad creaturam pertineat, omnis munda est: sed cum daemoniis inmolata fuerit, inquinata est tam diu quam diu simulacris offeratur. Quod mox atque factum est, non est jam Dei, sed idoli: quae dum in cibum sumitur, sumentem daemonio nutrit, non Deo, convivam illum simulacro reddendo, non Christo.' Novatian. de Cib. Judaic. cap. 7.

the German language, pursued the same hypothesis, and met with good acceptance among many. But in the year 1728, Mr. Elsner of Utrecht took occasion to animadvert upon it[w], blaming Olearius for pushing the point too far, in favour of the Lutheran doctrine concerning the Eucharist, and for maintaining too gross a notion of sacramental manducation. Others have endeavoured to defend or palliate Olearius's doctrine, and reflect upon Elsner, as too severe or disrespectful in his censure, and as straining things to the worst sense[x]. All I shall observe upon the dispute is, that both sides appear to agree in three particulars: 1. That the idolaters held communion with each other, by eating of the same sacrifices; to which answers, in the analogy, the communion of Christians with each other, by and in the Eucharist. 2. That the idolaters held communion with devils by feasting at the table of devils: to which answers our holding communion with Christ in the Eucharist. 3. That the devils with whom they so held communion, had thereby some power or influence over them: to which answer the Divine influences upon true and worthy communicants in the Eucharist.

V. There is yet another objection worth the considering, because it seems to strike at the main grounds upon which we have proceeded in explaining the Apostle's doctrine in this chapter. It is suggested, that δαιμόνιον in that place does not signify devil[y], but either a good demon, or something imaginary, a mere nonentity: and this is grounded partly upon the consideration that the Pagans could never intend to sacrifice to devils, and partly upon St. Paul's allowing an idol to be nothing. The reader may find this suggestion abundantly confuted, in Whitby and Wolfius upon this chapter; and therefore I shall here content myself with briefly hinting as follows: 1. That the word δαιμόνιον, commonly[z] in the New Testament, does signify some

[w] Elsner. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 108.

[x] Wolfius, Curae Crit. in 1 Cor. x. 21. p. 461. Mosheim. in Praefat. ad Cudworth de Coena.

[y] See Le Clerc in loc. in his Supplement to Hammond, p. 338. Engl. edit.

[z] A late learned writer very acutely as well as justly observes, that the sacred penmen, when speaking their own sense, and not reporting the words of others, do always use the word δαιμόνιον in the bad sense. Dr. Warren, part i. p. 75, part ii. p. 7, &c.

evil spirit, as in the many cases of demoniacs therein mentioned, besides other instances. 2. That in this place of St. Paul, the word ought to be so interpreted, in conformity to Deuteronomy xxxii. 17, which St. Paul appears to have had in his eye, 'They sacrificed unto devils, not to God;' which Le Clerc himself (who raises the objection which I am now answering) interprets of evil spirits[a]. 3. That St. Paul speaks not of what the heathens intended, or had in view, but of the real nature, tendency, or consequence of their idolatry. 4. That though St. Paul knew that idols, whether understood of statues and images, or of the deities supposed to reside in them, were really nothing, (as having either no being[b], as many had not, or no divinity[c], and were not capable of making any physical change in the meats, which were the good creatures of God; yet he knew withal, that evil spirits suggested to men those idolatrous practices, and resided in those images, and assisted in those services, personating those fictitious deities, and drawing all those adorations, in the last result, to themselves[d]: therefore St. Paul cautions the Corinthians against putting themselves into the power and possession of those evil spirits, which they were not before aware of[e]. 5. There can be no sense or no force in St. Paul's argument, if we interpret his words either of good demons or of mere nothings: for it would sound very odd to say, I would not have you partakers of good angels; or of nothings, that is, no partakers; and again, Ye cannot partake of the Lord's table, and the table of good angels or table of nonentities. Besides that the Apostle

[a] Ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ Θεῷ· Deut. xxxii. 17. Vid. Cleric. in loc. item in Levit. xvii. 7. Cacodaemonibus. See also Baruch iv. 7.

[b] Such as personalized qualities, mere abstract ideas; as mercy, justice, faith, truth, concord, health, fortune, &c.

[c] As sun, moon, stars, &c.

[d] 'Scimus nihil esse nomina mortuorum, sicut et ipsa simulacra eorum; sed non ignoramus qui sub istis nominibus, institutis simulacris operentur et gaudeant, et divinitatem mentiantur, nequam spiritus scilicet, daemones.' Tertull. de Spectac. cap. x. p. 77.

[e] 'Non quod idolum sit aliquid, (ut Apostolus ait,) sed quod quae faciunt, daemoniis faciunt, consistentibus scilicet in consecrationibus idolorum, sive mortuorum, sive (ut putant) deorum. Propterea igitur, quoniam utraque species idolorum conditionis unius est, dum mortui et dii unum sunt, utraque idololatria abstinemus ... quia non possumus coenam Dei edere, et coenam daemoniorum.' Tertull. ibid. cap. xiii. p. 79.

was obviating or refuting that very objection about an idol's being nothing; allowing it in a physical sense, but not in a moral one; allowing it of the idol considered in itself, but not of what it led to, and terminated in. Whatever men might think of bare idols, yet evil spirits, which promoted and accepted that idolatrous worship, were real beings, and very pernicious, many ways[f], to the worshippers, and to as many as were partners with them, either formally or in just construction. In this light, the Apostle's argument is clear and solid, and his sense strong and nervous; countenanced also by other Scriptures and the whole stream of antiquity.

VI. There are yet other objections, of a slighter kind, which I may here throw together, and briefly answer, that no further scruple may remain. A learned man very lately[g], in his Latin Notes upon Cudworth's treatise on the Sacrament, and in his Preface to the same, has taken a great deal of pains to explain, (should I say?) or rather to perplex and obscure the Apostle's argument in this chapter, and to turn it off to a different meaning from what I have been pleading for. His reason, or motive, for doing it, appears to be, to make it square the better with the Lutheran notion of the corporal presence in the Eucharist. He takes it for granted that both good and bad do equally receive the Lord's body and blood, (which is indeed the natural and necessary consequence of their other principles,) and therefore he cannot admit that the communion here spoken of should be understood of benefits, lest those benefits also should be supposed common to both, which is palpably absurd. He frankly enough discovers where his main scruple lies[h]; and then pro-

[f] Wolfius well distinguishes, in his Comments on this text, pp. 459, 460. 'Non tam hic quaeritur, quid gentilibus de deastris suis persuasum fuerit, quam quid illis persuasum esse debuerit, quidve ex rei veritate de illis sit judicandum: posterius hoc innuit Apostolus, et testatum adeo facit, cultum illum superstitiosum et a malis daemonibus profectum esse, et in illorum societatem pertrahere . . . Apostolus τὸ εἴδωλον quod nihil est, distinguit a δαιμονίοις, tanquam quae vere existant, et ex cultu praestito fructum percipiant, in perniciem sacrificantium redundantem; quemadmodum et οἱ θύοντες sacra sua faciant ea intentione, ut cum deastris conjungantur.'

[g] Joannes Laurentius Moshemius, Jenae, 1733.

[h] 'Quid sentiam de interpretatione hac verborum S. Pauli, itemque de argumento quod ex illis elicit vir doc-

ceeds to invent reasons, or colours, to support it. He pleads that St. Paul, in this place, mentions no distinction between worthy receivers and unworthy, but seems rather to make what he speaks of common to both; for he inserts no exception, or salvo, as he ought to have done, had his words been intended of receiving benefits[i], &c. To which I answer: 1. That there was no occasion for making any express distinction: it was sufficient to leave it to every one's good sense tacitly to supply. The Apostle speaks of it according to what it was in the general, and in God's design, and in its primary intention, and what it always would be in the event, if not rendered fruitless through some default of the communicants[k]: but as the real sacrifice of Christ's death, with the benefits thereof, was to extend no further than to persons qualified for it, and not to the impenitent; so every man's own reason would readily suggest to him, without a monitor, that the application of that sacrifice could not be of wider extent than the sacrifice itself. 2. Add to this, that nothing is more usual in Scripture than to omit such exceptions as common sense might readily supply; partly for the sake of brevity or elegancy, and partly for the avoiding impertinence or offence. How often are the benefits of Baptism spoken of in general and absolute terms, without any excepting clause with respect to unworthy partakers. It was needless to insert any; for Christians understood the terms of their Baptismal covenant,

tissimus (Cudworthus) ad opinionem suam probandam, in praefatione aperiam. . . Hic monuisse satis erit, premi ab eo vestigia praecipuorum reformati coetus doctorum, &c. . . . . velle enim hos notum est, ideo S. Coenam a Servatore nostro potissimum esse institutam, ut sancti homines, qui ad eam accedunt, cum Christo Servatore suo arctius conjungantur, et beneficiorum hominibus ab eo partorum reddantur participes: nos vero repudiare, qui omnes homines, sive probi sint, sive improbi, corporis et sanguinis Domini vere fieri compotes in S. Coena statuimus.' Moshem. in Notis ad cap. iv. sect. 2. p. 30.

[i] 'Si vera esset sententia, quae inter Reformatos recepta est, excepisset Paulus haud dubie degeneres Christianos ex illis qui Christi compotes fiunt in S. Coena, dixissetque: Nostisne eos homines, in quibus castus est animus et vera fides, corporis et sanguinis Christi compotes fieri?' Moshem. ibid. p. 31. Cp. Gerhard. et Albertin. Respon. p. 225.

[k] Chrysostom is very clear on this head, in Matt. Hom. lxxxiii. p. 788. Bened. ed. And so indeed are all the ancients, when rightly understood. None of them ever imagined that the 'res sacramenti,' the thing signified, was received at all by the unworthy, either spiritually or orally.

and did not want to be told perpetually, that Simon Magus and other the like wretches, though baptized, had no part in them. Many times does St. Paul remind Christians of their bodies being the members of Christ, or temple of God, or temple of the Holy Ghost[l], making no exception at all for corrupt Christians: he thought it best to omit invidious exceptions; not doubting but that such plain things would be tacitly understood by every one, without his naming them. Once indeed, after he had told the Corinthians of Christ being in them, he adds, 'except ye be reprobates[m].' But certainly it was neither necessary nor proper to be perpetually inculcating an invidious and grating reflection. The persons whom he wrote to, might not always be dull enough to want it, or bad enough to deserve it; a softer kind of address might be both more acceptable to them, and more effectual to incite them to all goodness. There is therefore no force at all in the negative argument drawn from St. Paul's omitting to make an express exception to the case of unworthy communicants in 1 Cor. x. 16; or however, he abundantly supplied it in the next chapter, and needed not to do it twice over in the same Epistle, and within the compass of forty verses.

But the learned Mosheim presently after subjoins another little plea[n], to add weight to the former. He asks, why should the Apostle so distinctly mention the communion both of the body and of the blood, if he intended no more than the fruits of Christ's death? Might not the single mention of his death or of its fruits have sufficed? To which we might justly answer, by asking the same question: What occasion could there be, upon his own principles, for distinctly mentioning both body and blood? Might not body alone have sufficed, especially considering how

[l] 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 15–20. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

[m] 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

[n] 'Deinde vir divinus distincte corporis et sanguinis Christi participes fieri dicit eos, qui poculum benedictum, et panem qui frangitur, acciperent in S. Coena. Quid distincta hac mentione tam corporis quam sanguinis Christi opus fuisset, si hoc tantum docere voluisset, mortis Christi fructum ad eos pervenire qui S. Coena fruerentur? Suffecisset ad hanc rem exprimendam, si generatim dixisset: minime vos praeterit, in Christi et mortis ejus communionem pervenire, quibus poculum consecratum et panis fractus in S. Coena exhibetur. Mosheim. ibid. p. 31. Cp. Gerhard. et Albertin. Respon. p. 225.

doubtful a point it has been thought, whether a glorified body has properly any blood in it or no[o]? The learned author might better have waved an objection which recoils so strongly upon his own hypothesis. To answer more directly, we say, upon our principles, that the distinct mentioning both of the body and the blood was exceeding proper, and very significant; because it shews that our Lord is considered in the Eucharist according to the state he was in at his crucifixion: for then only it was, that his body and blood were separate; one hanging on the cross, the other spilled upon the ground. That body and that blood are commemorated in the Eucharist, the body broken, and the blood shed: therefore St. Paul so distinctly mentioned both, lest Christians should think (as indeed, in late and dark ages, Christians have thought) that the words of the institution, though express for broken body, and blood shed upon earth, should be interpreted to mean his glorified body in heaven. St. Paul very justly followed the style of the institution, our Lord's own style: and by that he shewed, that he was speaking of the separation of the body and blood, which in reality was the death of our Lord, or seen only in his death, and consequently such manner of speaking directly pointed to the death of our Lord, and to the fruits or benefits arising from it. Mr. Mosheim goes on to make some slight objections to Dr. Cudworth's just notion of the partakers of the altar, as sharing the benefits or expiations thereof. It would be tedious to make a particular reply to every little objection which a pregnant wit can raise, and therefore I shall only say this: either he must understand it of a real communion of and with that God, whose altar it was, and then it implies benefits of course; or he must understand it only of external declarations or professions, such as hypocrites might make, and then it will be hard to shew how that agrees with the symbol of eating, which means receiving something, (not giving out declarations,) and is plainly so understood, not only in John vi., but also in Heb. xiii. 10, where eating of an altar is spoken of.

[o] Vid. Allix. Dissertat. de Sanguine D. N. Jesu Christi. Cp. l'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, part ii. cap. 6. p. 268.

Mr. Mosheim says no more in his Notes: but in his Preface, written afterwards, he pursues the same argument; and there he endeavours to invalidate the other parallel drawn from partaking of devils. He will not be persuaded[p] that the idolaters did really sacrifice to evil spirits: but it is certain they did; though they intended quite otherwise. And he will not allow that they were partakers of devils, because an idol is nothing: which has been abundantly answered before. I shall only add, that this learned writer was not perhaps aware, that he has been enforcing the objection of the idolaters, and labouring to elude St. Paul's answer to it, in contradiction to the Apostle's clear and express words. St. Paul granted that an idol physically was nothing, but that morally and circumstantially it stood in quite another view: for, though an idol was nothing; yet a devil, under the name or cover of an idol, was a real thing, and of very dangerous consequence, to make alliance with. But I proceed.

When this learned gentleman comes to propose his own interpretation of the whole passage, he does it in such an intricate and confused manner, as discovers it at once to be unnatural and forced. He first breaks the coherence of it, in a very particular way, and owns that he does so[q]. Then he proceeds to speak of St. Paul's abrupt and rapid manner of writing, and of his omitting many things for an interpreter to supply, (though before he would not allow him to omit a needless exception, which nobody almost could miss of,) and of his jumping to a conclusion, before he had sufficiently opened his premises[r]. Could one desire a

[p] 'Nunquam mihi persuaserim, sanctum hominem id sibi velle, profanos vere malis geniis, aut deastris immolare, quae immolarent: etenim haec sententia pugnaret cum eo quod paulo ante largitus erat Corinthiis, deastrum nihil, aut commentitium esse aliquid: si nihil est deaster, quomodo vere sacrificari potest illi aliquid?' Moshem. in Praefat.

[q] 'Exerceant, quibus placet, ingenium, experianturque, num demonstrare queant haec apta esse inter se, ac cohaerentia? Quae cum ita sint, cumque res ipsa testetur, nullam esse cognationem et affinitatem commati 16 et 17 cum consequente commate 18, reliquum est, ut constituamus, divellendum esse hoc posterius comma a prioribus binis, novamque ab eo partem orationis sancti hominis inchoandam esse,' &c. Moshem. in Praefat.

[r] 'Praecisam et concitatam esse multis in locis S. Pauli disputationem, et multa interdum ab eo omitti quae interpretis meditatione ac ingenio suppleri debent, quo perfectam

more sensible or more affecting token of the irresistible strength of the ancient and prevailing construction than this, that the acutest wit, joined with uncommon learning, can make no other sense of the place, but by taking such liberties with sacred Writ, as are by no means allowable upon any known rules of just and sober hermeneutics? I shall dwell no longer on this learned gentleman's speculations; which, I am willing to hope, are not the sentiments of all the Lutherans. They are confronted, in part, by the very learned Wolfius, as I observed above: and I am now going to take notice of the moderate sentiments of Baron Puffendorff (who was an able divine, as well as a consummate statesman) in his latest treatise, left behind him ready for the press, written in Latin, and printed in 1695[s]. He first candidly represents the principles of the Reformed, and next passes a gentle censure.

'Some say [meaning some of the Reformed] that...we must not believe the bread and wine to be a naked symbol, but a communication, or mean by which we come into participation of the body and blood of Christ, as St. Paul speaks, 1 Cor. x. 16. But of what sort that communion or communication is, whether physical or moral, may be very well gathered from that very place of St. Paul. By a physical communion, or participation, must be understood the conjunction of two bodies, as of water and wine, of meal and sugar: but by a moral one is meant, such as when anything partakes of the virtue and efficacy of another, and in that respect is accounted the same with the other, or is connected with it. As among the Jews, they who

demonstratio formam adipiscatur, neminem in scriptis istis versatum praeterit. Id hoc etiam in loco meminisse decet, quo divinus vir, sacro elatus fervore, et incredibili Corinthios emendandi studio accensus, ad demonstrationis conclusionem properat potius quam pergit, nec plura exprimit verbis quam summa postulat necessitas ad vim ejus capiendam. Quare qui rudiorum captui consulere, et universam argumentationem ejus nervis et partibus suis cohaerentem exhibere volunt, addere passim quaedam debent et interjicere, ad ea plane tollenda quae intelligentiam morari possunt.' Moshem. ibid.

[s] 'Jus feciale divinum: sive de Consensu et Dissensu Protestantium, exercitatio posthuma.' Lubecae, 1695.

The Divine feudal Law: or Means for the uniting of Protestants. Translated from the original by Theophilus Dorrington, 1703.

did eat of the flesh of the victim were made partakers of the altar; that is, of the Jewish worship, and of all the benefits which did accompany that worship. So also, they who did eat of things sacrificed to idols were partakers of devils; not for that they did eat the substance of the devils, but because they did derive upon themselves the guilt of idolatry. From all which things we may learn to understand the words of the institution in this sense—This bread eaten by the faithful, in the ceremony of this Supper, this wine also therein drank by such, shall have the same virtue and efficacy, as if you should eat the substance itself of my body, and drink the very substance of my blood. Or, this bread is put in the stead of the sacrificed flesh, this wine is in the stead of the sacrificed blood; whereby the covenant between God and men, having me for the mediator of it, is established. Nor indeed are such sort of expressions (importing an equivalence or substitution) uncommon, whether in holy Scripture or in profane writers. For example: "I have made God my hope[t]." Elijah was the "chariots of Israel, and the horsemen thereof[u]." "Woman, behold thy son; son, behold thy mother[x]." "He that doth the will of my Father, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother[y]." It is said of the enemies of the cross of Christ, "that their belly is their god[z]." So in Virgil we have the like phraseology, "Thou shalt be to me the great Apollo."

'But in articles of faith, it is safer to follow a naked simplicity, than to indulge the fancy in pursuit of subtilties. And it has been observed, that while the reins have been left too loose to human reason, in this article of the Lord's Supper, the other mysteries also of the Christian religion have been tampered with, so that by degrees Socinianism is at length sprung up. But if both sides would but sincerely profess, that in the Lord's Supper Christ's body and blood are verily and properly eaten and drank[a], and that there is a participation of the benefits by him purchased, all the controversy remaining is only about the

[t] Job xxxi. 24. [u] 2 Kings ii. 12. [x] John xix. 26, 27.
[y] Matt. xii. 50. [z] Phil. iii. 19.
[a] We say, 'Verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful.'

manner of eating and drinking, and of the presence of Christ's body and blood, which both sides confess to be above the reach of human capacity: and so they make use of reasonings, where is no room for reason [b].' So far this very judicious writer, a moderate Lutheran, and a person of admirable sagacity. I shall hereupon take the liberty to observe, that if the supposed corporal presence were but softened into corporal union, and that union understood to be of the mystical or moral kind, (like to that of man and wife making one flesh, or all true Christians, at any distance, making one body,) and if this union were reckoned among the fruits of Christ's death, received by the faithful in the Eucharist, then would everything of moment be secured on all sides: and the doctrine of the Eucharist, so stated, would be found to be altogether intelligible, rational, and scriptural, and confirmed by the united verdict of all antiquity.

As to Lutherans and Calvinists, however widely they may appear to differ in words and in names, yet their ideas seem all to concentre (as often as they come to explain) in what I have mentioned. The Calvinists, for example, sometimes speak of eating Christ's body and blood by faith, or by the mind; and yet they seem to understand nothing more than a kind of moral, virtual, spiritual, or mystical union [c], (such as bodies at a distance may have,) though perhaps they do not always explain it so happily as might be wished. On the other hand, the Lutherans when pressed to speak plainly, deny every article almost which they are commonly charged with by their adversaries. They disown assumption of the elements into the humanity of Christ [d], as likewise augmentation [e], and impanation [f]; yea, and consubstantiation [g], and concomitancy [h]: and, if it be asked, at

[b] Puffendorf. Eng. edit. sect. lxiii. pp. 211, 212, 213. Lat. edit. sect. lxiii. pp. 227, 228, 229.

[c] Vid. Albertin. pp. 230, 231. Pet. Martyr. in 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. p. 178.

[d] Vid. Pfaffius, Dissertat. de Consecrat. Eucharist. p. 449, &c. Buddaeus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. ii. pp. 80, 81.

[e] Pfaffius, p. 451, &c. Buddaeus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. ii. pp. 81, 82.

[f] Pfaffius, p. 453. Buddaeus, ibid. p. 83. Deylingius, Observ. Miscell. p. 249.

[g] Pfaffius, p. 453, &c. Buddaeus, ibid. p. 84. Deylingius, ibid.

[h] Pfaffius, ibid. p. 459. Buddaeus, ibid. pp. 85, 86.

length, what they admit and abide by, it is a sacramental union[i]; not a corporal presence, but as a body may be present spiritually[j]. And now, what is a sacramental union, with a body spiritually present, while corporally absent? Or what ideas can any one really have under these terms, more than that of a mystical or moral union, (such as Baron Puffendorf speaks of,) an union as to virtue and efficacy, and to all saving intents and purposes? So far both parties are agreed, and the remaining difference may seem to lie chiefly in words and names, rather than in ideas, or real things[k]. But great allowances should be made for the prevailing prejudices of education, and for a customary way of speaking or thinking on any subject.

CHAP. IX.

Of Remission of Sins conferred in the EUCHARIST.

THIS is an article which has been hitherto touched upon only as it fell in my way, but will now require a particular discussion: and that it may be done the more distinctly and clearly, it will be proper to take in two or three previous propositions, which may be of use to prevent misconceptions of what we mean, and

[i] Pfaffius, p. 461, &c. Buddaeus, ibid. p. 86, &c.

[j] 'Quinimo et corporalis praesentia negatur, quae tamen ea ratione adstruitur, ut corpus Christi vere, licet spiritualiter praesens esse credatur. Caeterum cum corpus Christi ubique junctam divinitatem habeat, ea et in sacra coena praesens est; singulari tamen et incomprehensibili ratione, quae omnes imperfectiones excludit.' Pfaffius, p. 462. 'Praesentiam realem profitemur, carnalem negamus.' Puffend. sect. 92.

'Unicus itaque saltem isque verus et genuinus praesentiae realis superest modus, unio sacramentalis; quae ita comparata est, ut, juxta ipsius Servatoris nostri institutionem, pani benedicto tanquam medio divinitus ordinato corpus, et vino benedicto tanquam medio divinitus ordinato sanguis Christi (modo quem ratio comprehendere nequit) uniatur: ut cum illo pane corpus Christi una manducatione sacramentali, et cum illo vino sanguinem Christi una bibitione sacramentali, in sublimi mysterio sumamus, manducemus, et bibamus.' Buddaeus, ibid. pp. 86, 87.

[k] 'Testatur Zanchius, se audivisse quendam non vulgarem Lutheranum dicentem, se et alios suos non ita dicere corpus Christi a nobis corporaliter manducari, quasi illud Christi corpus os et corpus nostrum attingat (hoc enim falsum esse) sed tantum propter sacramentalem unionem, qua id quod proprie competit pani, attribuitur etiam quodammodo ipsi corpori Christi. In hisce ergo convenimus.' Sam. Ward. Theolog. Determinat. p. 113.

to open the way to what we intend to prove. The previous propositions are: 1. That it is God alone who properly confers remission. 2. That he often does it in this life present, as seems good unto him, on certain occasions, and in sundry degrees. 3. That he does it particularly in Baptism, in a very eminent degree. These several points being premised and proved, it will be the easier afterwards to shew that he does it also in the Eucharist, as likewise to explain the nature and extent of the remission there conferred.

1. I begin with premising, that God alone properly confers remission of sins: whatever secondary means or instruments may be made use of in it, yet it is God that does it. 'Who can forgive sins but God only[l]?' We read, that 'it is God that justifieth[m].' Justification of sinners comes to the same with remission: it is receiving them as just; which amounts to acquitting, or absolving them, in the court of heaven. For proof of this, I refer the reader to Bishop Bull's Harmonia Apostolica[n], that I may not be tedious in a very plain case. The use I intend of the observation, with respect to our present subject, is, that if we are said to eat or drink, in the Eucharist, the benefits of Christ's passion, (among which remission of sins is one,) or if we are said to apply those benefits, and of consequence that remission, to ourselves, by faith, &c., all this is to be understood only of our receiving such remission, and partaking of those benefits, while it is God that grants and confers, and who also, properly speaking, applies every benefit of that kind to the faithful communicant. And whether he does it by his word or by his ordinances, and by the hands of his ministers, he does it however: and when such absolution, or remission, is real and true, it is not an human absolution, but a divine grant, transmitted to us by the hands of men administering the ordinances of God. God has sometimes sent his extraordinary grants of that kind by prophets and other officers extraordinary[o]: and he may do the like in a fixed and standing method, by his ordinary officers or ministers duly commissioned thereunto[p]. But whoever he be that

[l] Mark ii. 7. [m] Rom. viii. 33. [n] Bull, Harmon. Apostol. Dissert. i. cap. 1. [o] 2 Sam. xii. 13. Compare Ecclus. xlvii. 11. [p] Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 16, 17, 18. John xx. 22, 23. Acts xxii. 16.

brings the pardon, or who pursuant to commission notifies it to the party in solemn form, yet the pardon, if true, is the gift of God, and it is God alone, or the Spirit of God, that applies it to the soul, and converts it to spiritual nutriment and increase. This, I presume, may be looked upon as a ruled point, and needs not more words to prove it.

2. The next thing I have to premise is, that God often confers remission, or justification, for the time being, in this life present, with certain and immediate effect, according to the degree or extent of it. All remission is not final, nor suspended upon what may come after: but there is such a thing as present remission, distinct from the final one, and which may or may not continue to the end, but is valid for the time being, and is in its own nature (no cross circumstances intervening) irrevocable. Let us come to particulars, in proof of the position. Jesus said unto the sick of the palsy, 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee [q].' There was present remission of some kind or other, to some certain degree, antecedent to the day of judgment, and of force for the time being. So again, our Lord's words, 'Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted[r],' &c., do plainly suppose and imply a present remission to some degree or other, antecedently to the great day, and during this present life. 'All that believe,' (viz. with a faith working by love,) 'are justified[s],' &c. The text speaks plainly of a present justification, or remission: for both amount to the same, as I have hinted before. St. Paul speaks of sincere converts, as 'being justified freely by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ[t];' and soon after mentions 'remission of sins past[u],' meaning remission then present; as indeed he could not mean anything else. In another place, he speaks of justification as then actually received, or obtained: 'Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ . . . by whom we have now received the atonement[v].' Elsewhere he says, 'Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God[w].' Again: 'You being dead in

[q] Mark ii. 5, 9. Luke v. 20. [r] John xx. 23. [s] Acts xiii. 39.
[t] Rom. iii. 24. [u] Rom. iii. 25. [v] Rom. v. 1, 11. [w] 1 Cor. vi. 11.

your sins . . . hath he quickened, . . . having forgiven you all trespasses [x].' I shall take notice but of one text more: 'I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you [y].' So then, present remission, in some cases or circumstances, may be justly looked upon as a clear point. Nevertheless, we are to understand it in a sense consistent with what St. Paul teaches elsewhere: 'We are made partakers of Christ, (finally,) if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end [z].' There is a distinction to be made between present and final justification: not that one is conditional and the other absolute, (for both are absolute in their kind, being founded in absolute grants,) but in one case, the party may live long enough to need a new grant; in the other, he is set beyond all danger or doubtfulness. Present justification amounts to a present right or claim to heaven upon Gospel terms, and presupposes the performance of everything stipulated so far, and is therefore absolute for the time being [a]. As to future perseverance, because it is future, it comes not into present account, and so is out of the question, as to present justification [b], or present stipulation. Perseverance is conditionally stipulated, that is to say, upon the supposition or condition that we live longer: but the question concerning our present claim to heaven upon the Gospel terms, turns only upon what is present, and what serves for the time being. A present right is not therefore no right, or not certain for the present, because of its being liable to forfeiture, on such and such suppositions, afterwards. This I observe here, to remove the prejudices which some may possibly conceive against the very notion of present remission, (either in the Sacraments or out of them,) only because it is not absolute in every view, and upon every

[x] Coloss. ii. 13.

[y] 1 John ii. 12.

[z] Heb. iii. 14.

[a] 'Hic dico, quod notandum est, quemvis justificatum praestitisse integram foederis Evangelici conditionem, pro statu in quo est. Quisquis fide in Christum δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη praeditus est, is eo momento praestitit integram foederis Evangelici conditionem quae, in statu in quo est, ab ipso requiritur, etiamsi jugis et pia operatio adhuc desit: proinde ex foedere illo justificatur, atque ad omnia foederis ejusdem beneficia jus habet.' Bull. Resp. ad Animad. iii. sect. vi. p. 539.

[b] 'Haec conditio jugis operationis in evangelico foedere non absolute requiritur, sed ex hypothesi; nempe si Deus vitam largitus fuerit.' Bull. ibid.

supposition, but upon the present view only, or in the circumstances now present. Indeed, remission of sins is a kind of continued act of God towards good men, often repeated in this life, and more and more confirmed the more they improve; ascertained to them, against all future chances, at their departure hence, but not finally, or in the most solemn form conferred, before the day of judgment.

3. I proceed to observe, that such present remission, as I have hitherto been speaking of, is ordinarily conferred in the Sacrament of Baptism, where there is no obstacle on the part of the recipient. Even the Baptism of John, upon repentance, instrumentally conveyed remission of sins[c]: much more does the Baptism of Christ. 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God[d].' This implies that Water-baptism, ordinarily, is requisite to remission, and consequently is an ordinary means of conveying it. But there are other texts more express: 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins . . . the promise is . . . to all that are afar off[e],' &c. Ananias's words to Saul are very remarkable; 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins[f]:' words too clear and express to be eluded by any Socinian evasions. And so are those other words; 'Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word[g].' The same doctrine is again taught by St. Paul, where he speaks of the 'putting off the body of sins, by the circumcision of Christ[h];' by Christian circumcision, that is, by Baptism. The same thing is implied in our being 'saved by the laver of regeneration[i],' and 'saved by Baptism[j],' and having 'hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience[k].' It is in vain to plead against remission of sins in either of the Sacraments, on account of their being considered in the recipient as single acts: for since it is certain fact, that such remission is conferred in and by Baptism, there must be some fallacy in that kind of reasoning, whether

[c] Mark i. 4. [d] John iii. 5. [e] Acts ii. 38, 39. [f] Acts xxii. 16. [g] Ephes. v. 25, 26. Compare Pearson on the Creed, Article x. p. 556. [h] Coloss. ii. 12, 13. See Dr. Wall, Hist. of Inf. Bapt. part i. c. 2. Defence, p. 269, &c. [i] Tit. iii. 5. [j] 1 Peter iii. 21. [k] Heb. x. 22.

we can espy it or not, and it can be of no weight against plain and certain fact. But I have hinted in my introduction, and elsewhere [1], where the error and misconception of such reasoning lies: and I shall only add here, that if a king were to send out his general letters of pardon for all submissive offenders, who, after renewing their bonds of allegiance, would come and take out their pardon in certain form, it would be no objection to the validity of their pardon, as conveyed by such form, that the submitting to it was but part of the condition, and not the whole, so long as it presupposes everything besides. I may note also, by the way, that no just objection can be made against the general notion of God's conferring pardon by the ministry of men, since it is certain that he does it in the Sacrament of Baptism, which is administered by the hands of men commissioned thereunto.

Having thus despatched the three previous propositions, preparatory to what I intend, I now proceed directly to the subject of the present chapter, which is to shew, that God confers remission of sins in or by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as by the Sacrament of Baptism. The analogy which there is between the two Sacraments, considered as Sacraments, is itself a strong presumption of it; unless there were some very good reason to be given why remission should be granted there, and not here. The once granting of remission is no argument against repeating and renewing it, time after time, if there may be any new occasion for it, or if frequent renewals may add more abundant strength and firmness to what was before done, either for greater security or greater consolation.

It may be said, perhaps, that Baptism was necessary to give any person a covenant-right to pardon upon repentance, but that when a man is once entered into covenant, then repentance alone suffices, and there is no longer need of submitting to any other public, solemn form of remission, as an instrument of pardon. I allow, there is not precisely the same need; and yet I will not presume to maintain that there may not be great need, notwithstanding. It is one thing to say, that remission is given in the Eucharist, as well as in Baptism; and another to say, that the

[1] See above, ch. viii. pp. 187, 188.

Eucharist is as necessary to remission, as Baptism. Baptism may be the first and grand absolution; and the Eucharist may be only second to it: the Eucharist may be an instrument of remission, but not the prime or chief instrument. I am aware that it was St. Austin's doctrine, (and, I think, of the Schools after him,) that baptismal remission looks not only backwards to sins past, but forwards also to future transgressions, and has its federal effect for remission of sins repented of, all our lives long[m]. But yet that consideration never hindered him, nor others of the same sentiments with him, from believing, that remission of sins is granted in and by the Eucharist[n], as well as by the other Sacrament. Only, they might think, that Baptism is eminently and emphatically the Sacrament of remission, and the other, of spiritual growth; one is more peculiarly the instrument of justification, while sanctification is the eminent privilege of the other. Nevertheless, justification and sanctification, though distinct in notion, are yet so closely connected in the spiritual life, that they commonly go together, and so whatever tends to increase either, increases both. And though it is certainly true, that the Gospel covenant promises remission upon repentance, yet receiving the Communion, as it is an article of Christian obedience, is included in the notion of repentance, making a part of it, as often as we may and ought to receive. But besides that, as repentance alone, without a continual application of the great atonement, is of no avail upon the foot of the Christian covenant, nor can be accepted at the throne of grace; the least that we can say of the

[m] 'Sic, inquam, hoc accipiendum est, ut eodem lavacro regenerationis et verbo sanctificationis, omnia prorsus mala hominum regeneratorum mundentur, atque sanentur: non solum peccata quae omnia nunc remittuntur in Baptismo, sed etiam quae posterius humana ignorantia vel infirmitate contrahuntur. Non ut Baptisma quotiens peccatur totiens repetatur; sed quia ipso quod semel datur, fit, ut non solum antea, verum etiam postea quorumlibet peccatorum venia fidelibus impetretur. Quid enim prodesset vel ante Baptismum poenitentia, nisi Baptismus sequeretur, vel postea, nisi praecesserit?' Augustin. de Nupt. et Concupisc. lib. i. p. 298. tom. x. edit. Bened. Conf. Sam. Ward. Determ. Theolog. p. 57. Vossius de Baptism. Disp. vi. p. 277. Turretin. Institut. Theolog. tom. iii. p. 460, &c. Hesychius, of the fifth century, expressed it thus: 'Virtus praecedentis baptismatis operatur et in ea, quae postea acta fuerit, poenitentia.' In Levit. lib. ii. p. 118.

[n] Vid. Augustin. de Peccat. Mer. et Rem. lib. i. cap. 24.

expediency of the Eucharist, in that respect, is, that it amounts to a public, solemn, certain application of Christ's merits, for the rendering our repentance acceptable, (which no other service except Baptism does,) and therefore it is a service carrying in it the liveliest assurance, and the strongest consolation, with respect to that very remission promised upon our serious repentance. Baptism once received may perhaps justly be supposed to carry in it the force of such continued application all our lives after: but yet it was not for nothing, that God appointed another Sacrament, supplemental to Baptism, for carrying on the same thing, or for the more effectual securing the same end. It is further to be considered, that if the Eucharist includes in it (as shall be shewn in its place) a renewal of the baptismal covenant, it must of course be conceived to carry in it a renewal of baptismal remission also: and remission, on God's part, is a kind of continued act, always growing, always improving, during the several stages and advances of the Christian life [o]. Besides, if Divine wisdom, among other reasons, has superadded the solemnity of Baptism to repentance, in order to fix the repentance more strongly, and to render it accepted, as also to make the pardon therein granted the more affecting and memorable; it is obvious to perceive how the solemnity of the Eucharist is fitted to serve the like purposes; and is therefore the more likely to have been intended for another public and sensible application of the merits of Christ's death, and a channel of remission [p], succedaneous to Baptism, in some views, and so far

[o] 'Justificatio et sanctificatio sunt actus quidem perpetuus, in quo et Deus semper donat, et homo semper recipit. Tota itaque vita homo fidelis poscit remissionem peccatorum, et renovationem sui: tota item vita utrumque impetrat. Habet ante, sed consequitur tum conservationem tum incrementum ejus quod habet. Omnibus credentibus opus, ut tum fides tum gratia fide percepta foveatur, alatur, augeatur. Omnibus igitur credentibus et verbi, et sacramentorum adminiculo opus est,' &c. Vossius de Sacr. Vi et Effic. p. 252.

[p] 'By the same reason that it came to be thought needful to make use of sensible means to convey or assure to mankind God's pardon and grace upon their first conversion to Christianity, by the same, or a greater reason, it must be judged to be so, to make use of the like sensible means to convey or assure the same grace and pardon, after men have in any measure forfeited the interest they had in the other.

'By the same reason again, that it came to be thought needful to exact of us sensible declarations of

serving instead of a repetition of it. But whether we are right or wrong in these and the like plausible reasonings upon the analogy of the two Sacraments, or upon their common, or distinct uses, yet if we can prove the fact, that the Eucharist really is an instrument of remission, or a Gospel form of absolution, we need not then concern ourselves much about the rationale of the thing: our positive proofs will be sufficient without it. This then is what I shall now proceed to, following the light of Scripture and antiquity.

1. That remission of sins is ordinarily conferred in the Eucharist, follows undeniably from the doctrine of 1 Cor. x. 16, as explained in the preceding chapter of this work. For if we are therein partakers of Christ's death, with the fruits thereof; and if the atonement be one of those fruits, and indeed the first and principal; and if remission follows the atonement, wherever it is truly applied; it is manifest from these considerations taken together, that remission is conferred, or (which comes to the same) renewed and confirmed, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. This argument is built upon a very clear and allowed maxim, that the effect must answer to the cause, and the fruits to the stock from whence they grow [q]. Besides, to deny that the Eucharist carries remission with it seems to make it rather a memorial of the reconcilement, than an actual participation of it: which is what the Socinians do indeed teach, but have been confuted (if I may take leave to say so) in the foregoing chapters.

2. I go on to our Lord's own words in the institution: 'Drink ye all of this: for this is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.' Our Lord here mentions the remission of sins as the effect or fruit of

our renouncing the errors of our unconverted state ... by the same, or a greater reason, must it be judged to be so, to exact of us the like sensible declarations, after we have, by our disobedience, departed from, and prevaricated our former ones.' Towerson on the Sacrament, p. 158.

The author here resolves the reason of granting remission by the Eucharist, into the expediency of sensible means to testify repentance on man's part, for sins committed after Baptism, and for the greater solemnity of granting pardon, on God's part. Which appears to be a very just account of it, in part, or it is, at least, a sufficient answer to objections drawn from the rationale of the thing.

[q] See Dr. Pelling's Disc. on the Sacrament, p. 138, &c.

the blood shed: that very blood shed is what we symbolically drink in the Eucharist, together with the fruits of it, as hath been abundantly proved above: therefore we drink remission in the Eucharist, which is one of those fruits. To enforce the argument, observe but with what emphasis our Lord says, 'Drink ye all of this: for this is,' &c. Why such a stress laid upon drinking this blood shed for remission, if they were not to drink remission in the very act? Commemorating will not answer the purpose: for drinking is the constant symbol of receiving something in, not of commemorating, which is paying out: and I have often observed before, that receiving in this instance must, in the very nature of the act, mean present receiving: therefore again, the receiving symbolically in the Eucharist that justifying blood of Christ, must of consequence amount to receiving present remission of sins. Bishop Taylor works up the argument a little differently, thus: 'The body receives the body of the mystery, (we eat and drink the symbols with our mouths), but faith feeds upon the mystery itself, it entertains the grace . . . which the Spirit of God conveys under that signature. Now, since the mystery is perfectly and openly expressed to be the remission of sins, if the soul does the work of the soul, as the body the work of the body, the soul receives remission of sins, as the body does the symbols and the Sacrament[r].'

The Socinians here object, that the text does not say that the Eucharist is ordained for remission, but that the blood, the blood spilled upon the cross, was shed for remission. But it is obvious to reply, that that blood which was once literally given for remission, upon the cross, is now every day symbolically and mystically given in the Eucharist, and given with all its fruits: therefore remission of sins is given. Such is the nature of symbolical grants, as I have before explained at large: they exhibit what they represent, convey what they signify, and are in divine construction and acceptance, though not literally or substantially, the very thing which they supply the place of. Which is so true in this case, that the very attributes of the signs and things

[r] Taylor's Worthy Communicant, p. 51.

signified are reciprocally predicated of each other: the body is represented as broken [s], though that attribute properly belongs to the bread; and the cup, by a double figure, is said to be shed for you [t], when, in strictness of speech, that attribute belongs only to the blood. This is further confirmed from the analogy which there is between the representative blood in the Eucharist, and the typical blood of the ancient Passover. For as the blood there was a token of remission, and made instrumental to remission, so is it also in the symbolical blood of the Eucharist; and thus everything answers [u]. The blood likewise of the ancient sacrifices, prefiguring the blood of Christ, was a token of a covenant [v], and conveyed remission, (legal directly, and evangelical indirectly,) and therefore the symbolical blood of the Eucharist figuring the same blood of Christ, cannot but be understood to convey remission as effectually, yea and more effectually than the other, which the very phrases here made use of, parallel to the former, strongly argue.

I shall only add further, that since there certainly is spiritual manducation in the Eucharist, as before shewn, and since remission of sins, by all accounts, and even by the Socinians, is allowed to be included in spiritual manducation; it will plainly follow, that remission of sins is conveyed in and by the Eucharist; which was to be proved.

Having thus far argued the point from Scripture principles, I may now proceed to inquire what additional light may be borrowed from authorities, ancient or modern. I shall draw together a summary account of what the primitive churches taught in this article, and shall afterwards consider, very briefly, the doctrine of our own Church on the same head.

The learned author of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, having previously observed of Baptism, that it was esteemed the grand absolution of all, proceeds soon after to take notice of the absolution granted in the Eucharist, and gives this general account of it:

[s] 1 Cor. xi. 24.
[t] Luke xxii. 20.
[u] See above, ch. ii. p. 45.
[v] Exod. xxiv. 8. See Nature and Obligation of the Christian Sacraments, vol. iv. p. 103.

'It had some relation to penitential discipline, but did not solely belong to it. For it was given to all baptized persons who never fell under penitential discipline, as well as to those who lapsed and were restored to communion: and in both respects, it was called τὸ τέλειον, the perfection, or consummation, of a Christian; there being no higher mystery that an ordinary Christian could partake of. To those who never fell into such great sins as required a public penance, it was an absolution from lesser sins, which were called venial, and sins of daily incursion: and to penitents who had lapsed, it was an absolution from those greater sins for which they were fallen under censure [w].' To this may be added, that the name of ἐφόδιον, 'viaticum,' which means provision for one's journey into the other world, and which was frequently given to the Eucharist, in the fourth century [x], and so on, is a general proof of the sense of the Church in those times with respect to remission in the holy Communion: for as that name imports more, so it certainly implies remission of sins, as part of the idea belonging to it.

After this brief general account, let us come to particulars. The elder Fathers, of the two first centuries, (so far as I have observed,) make not express mention of remission of sins in the Eucharist, though they are explicit enough with respect to Baptism. Their common way, with regard to the Eucharist, was to pass over remission, and to go higher up to sanctification of the Spirit, and spiritual or mystical union with Christ, and the consequent right to glory and immortality and eternal life. Perhaps they might conceive it low and diminutive, in that case, to speak at all of remission, which was but the initiatory part, and belonged more peculiarly to the initiatory Sacrament, which in those times, and in the case of adults, immediately preceded the other. However that were, we find proofs sufficient from the writers of the third century [y], that the Eucharist was thought to be of a propitiatory nature, in virtue of the great sacrifice therein

[w] Bingham, book xix. c. 1.

[x] Testimonies are collected by Casaubon, Exercit. N. lii. p. 415.

[y] Suicer, in Ἐφόδιον, p. 1290. Bingham, book xv. cap. 4. sect. 9; book xviii. cap. 4. sect. 3. Mabillon de Liturg. Gall. p. 85.

commemorated: and though the elder Fathers do not directly say so, they tacitly supposed or insinuated the same thing, by their standing discipline and by their so often calling the Eucharist a sacrifice well-pleasing to God: besides that the sanctification which they do speak of, as conferred in the Eucharist, implied remission of sins, either as then granted, or at least then confirmed and established.

Origen is one that speaks plainly of the propitiatory nature of the Eucharist[z]; understanding it in a qualified sense, as being propitiatory only in virtue of the grand sacrifice, or as all acceptable services are, in some sense, appeasing and pacificatory.

Cyprian, of the same time, takes notice of the sacramental cup as relieving the sad and sorrowful heart, before oppressed with the anguish of sins, and now overjoyed with a sense of the Divine indulgence[a]. From which words it is manifest, that it was God's pardon (not merely the Church's reconciliation) which was supposed to be conveyed in and by the Eucharist; which is further evident from the noted story of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria his sending the Eucharist to Serapion at the point of death, and the reflections which he made upon it, as being instrumental towards the wiping out his sins before his departure[b]. Such was the prevailing notion of that time in relation to remission of sins, as conferred in the Eucharist. 'Some ancient writers' (I use the words of Mr. Bingham) 'acknowledge no other sorts of absolution but only two; the baptismal absolution which is antecedent to all penitential discipline, and this of reconciling public penitents to the communion of the altar: because this latter comprehends all other ways of absolution, in the several acts and ceremonies that were used in conferring it[c].' Another very learned writer has made the like observation, in the words here following: 'They that have with the greatest

[z] 'Si respicias ad commemorationem de qua dicit Dominus, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, invenies, quod ista est commemoratio sola quae propitium facit hominibus Deum.' Origen. in Levit. Hom. xiii. p. 255.

[a] 'Epotato sanguine Domini, moestum pectus ac triste, quod prius peccatis angentibus premebatur, Divinae indulgentiae laetitia resolvatur: quod tum demum potest laetificare in Ecclesia Domini bibentem,' &c. Cypr. Ep. lxiii. p. 107, alias 153.

[b] Vid. Euseb. E. H. lib. vi. c. 44. p. 318.

[c] Bingham, book xix. cap. 1. sect. 6.

diligence searched into antiquity, can discover no other rite or solemnity used upon this occasion, but barely the admitting the penitents to communion: by this they were entirely acquitted and absolved from the censure under which their crimes had laid them: by this their sins were remitted to them, and so they became once more fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God [d].'

For the fourth century, Eusebius may be an evidence to prove the doctrine of remission in and by the Eucharist, where he says; 'We moreover offer the show-bread, while we revive the salutary memorial and the blood of sprinkling of the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world, the purgative of our souls [e].' He seems here to understand the blood of Christ as making the purgation directly, and the salutary memorial as doing it indirectly, and in virtue of the other. He speaks plainer elsewhere, directly saying, that Christians receive remission of sins in the daily memorial which they celebrate, viz. the memorial of our Lord's body and blood [f].

Cyril of the same century styles the Eucharist the sacrifice of propitiation [g], (in such a sense as I have before hinted with relation to Origen,) and he supposes it to be offered in order to render God propitious, which amounts to the same as if he had said, for remission of sins [h].

Ephraem Syrus, of the same age, supposes that the Eucharist purifies the soul from its spots, that is, from its sins [i]. And Ambrose [j] scruples not to ascribe to the bread consecrated

[d] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 210: compare p. 107, and part i. p. 284, &c. Cp. Morin. de Poenitent. lib. iv. c. 21, 22.

[e] Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως προσφέρομεν, τὴν σωτήριον μνήμην ἀναζωπυροῦντες, τό τε τοῦ ῥαντισμοῦ αἷμα τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ περιελόντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, καθάρσιον τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν. Euseb. in Psalm. xci. p. 608.

[f] Διὰ τῆς ἐνθέου καὶ μυστικῆς διδασκαλίας πάντες ἡμεῖς οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτημάτων εὑράμεθα . . . εἰκόταις τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ὁσημέραι ἐπιτελοῦντες, κ.τ.λ. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. ii. c. 10. p. 37.

[g] Τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ. Cyrill. Mystag. v. sect. 8. p. 327. Cp. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 155, &c.

[h] Χριστὸν ἐσφαγιασμένον προσφέρομεν, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν, ἐξιλεούμενοι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν. Cyrill. Mystag. v. sect. 10. p. 328.

[i] 'Animae accedentes per illa tremenda mysteria macularum purificationem accipiunt.' Ephr. Syr. de Sacerdotio, p. 3.

[j] 'Ego sum panis vitae; etiamsi quis mortuus fuerit, tamen si panem

remission of sins; which is to be understood with some allowance for a figurative way of speaking. He speaks indeed of the living bread, that is, of Christ himself, but considered as symbolically received in the Eucharist; which is manifest from his referring to 1 Cor. xi. 28, 'Let a man examine himself.'

St. Austin appears to have been in the same sentiments exactly: where speaking of the grand sacrifice, by which alone true remission [k] comes, he immediately adds, that all Christians are invited to drink the blood of it, meaning in the Eucharist.

All the ancient Liturgies are full of the same notion of remission of sins conferred in this Sacrament. And though they are mostly spurious, or interpolated, and answer not strictly to the names which they commonly bear, yet some of them have been in use for many centuries upwards in the Greek, Latin, and Oriental churches, and are a good proof of the universality of a doctrine for the time they obtained. The Clementine, though it is not thought to have been ever in public use, is commonly believed to be the oldest of any now extant: and though, as an entire collection, it cannot perhaps be justly set higher than the fifth century, yet it certainly contains many things derived from earlier times, and among those, probably, the doctrine of eucharistical remission. In that Liturgy prayer is made, that the Holy Spirit may so bless the elements, that the communicants may obtain remission of sins [l]. And in the post-communion, prayer is again made that the receiving of the Eucharist may turn to salvation, not condemnation, to the benefit both of body and soul, to the preserving true piety, and to remission of sins [m].

meum acceperit, vivet in aeternum: ille enim accipit qui seipsum probat. Qui autem accipit, non moritur peccatoris morte; quia panis hic remissio peccatorum est.' Ambros. de Benedict. Patriarch. c. ix. p. 525.

[k] 'Illis sacrificiis hoc unum sacrificium significabatur, in quo vera fit remissio peccatorum. A cujus tamen sacrificii sanguine non solum nemo prohibetur, sed ad bibendum potius omnes exhortantur qui volunt habere vitam.' Augustin. in Levit. tom. iii. pp. 516, 517. Cp. Damascen. de Fid. lib. iv. c. 13. p. 271.

[l] "Ινα οἱ μεταλαβόντες αὐτοῦ . . . ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, κ.τ.λ. Apostol. Const. lib. viii. c. 12. p. 407.

[m] Καὶ παρακαλέσωμεν μὴ εἰς κρίμα, ἀλλ' εἰς σωτηρίαν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι, εἰς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰς φυλακὴν εὐσεβείας, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. κ.τ.λ. Apost. Constit. lib. viii. c. 14. p. 410.

Conformable to this pattern are the later Liturgies: particularly that which is called Basil's, according to the Alexandrian use, in Renaudot's edition [n]. And another, entitled Gregory's Liturgy [o]. The same thing is observable in the Liturgies which go under the names of apostles or evangelists, collected by Fabricius: as St. James's [p], St. Peter's [q], St. Matthew's [r], St. Mark's [s], and St. John's [t]. The Liturgy under the name of Chrysostom, published by Goar, has the like forms [u]. So also have the Oriental Liturgies in Renaudotius's Collection, volume the second, and the Latin ones published by Mabillon; of which it would be tedious here to speak more particularly; as it is also needless to trouble the reader with more references in a very clear point. Upon the whole, there appears to have been a general consent of the Christian churches all along as to the point of eucharistical remission of sins: which is proved, not only from the testimonies of single Fathers, but from the ancient standing discipline of the Church, and from the concurring language of all the ancient Liturgies now extant.

As to the judgment of the first Reformers abroad, it is well known to fall in with the same: or if any doubt should be, let Luther answer for the Lutherans [v], and for the Calvinists Calvin [w].

The judgment of our own Church will easily be proved to

[n] Basil. Liturg. Alex. pp. 61, 69, 71; apud Renaud. vol. i.

[o] Gregorii Liturg. pp. 92, 95, 98, 106.

[p] Jacobi Liturg. pp. 38, 41, 68, 71, 72, 86, 101, 111, 113, 120.

[q] Petri Liturg. pp. 175, 195.

[r] Matth. Liturg. pp. 216, 245, 248.

[s] Marci Liturg. pp. 261, 299, 315, 316.

[t] Joannis Liturg. p. 203.

[u] Goar. Euchol. pp. 77, 80, 82.

[v] 'Pertinet huc pulcherrima gradatio Lutheri: "Calix Eucharisticus continet vinum: vinum exhibet Christi sanguinem: sanguis Christi complectitur novum testamentum, quia est novi testamenti sanguis: novum testamentum continet remissionem peccatorum. Ergo, bibitio ex calice Eucharistico applicat, obsignat, et confirmat credentibus, promissionem de remissione peccatorum."...Sacramentum illud ipsum quod signat, etiam confert, et exhibet.' Gerhard. loc. Comm. de Sacr. Coena, c. xx. p. 178.

[w] 'Christi consilium fuit, corpus suum sub pane edendum porrigere in remissionem peccatorum.' Calvin. Admonit. ult. ad Westphal. p. 950. Cp. Instit. lib. iv. c. 17. sect. 42.

Lambertus Danaeus cautiously words the doctrine thus: 'Coena Domini...est applicatio semel a Christo factae peccatorum nostrorum remissionis.' Epist. ad Eccles. Gallican. 1498.

concur in the same article, from the known language of our Communion Office, and Homilies. In our public Service, we pray, that 'our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood.' The propositions couched under these words are several: 1. That our bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost. 2. That sin defileth them. 3. That the sacrifice of Christ, removing guilt, (other due circumstances supposed,) makes them clean. 4. That there is an application of that sacrifice made in the Eucharist. 5. That therefore such application ought to be prayed for. So much for the body. The like, with a little change, may be understood also of the soul: and the conclusion from both parts is that guilt is washed away in the Sacrament, duly administered, and duly received, both from body and soul; which in other words amounteth to this, that remission of sins is conferred by the Eucharist, to all worthy receivers.

In a thanksgiving prayer, of the same Service, we pray that 'we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins,' beseeching the Divine Majesty, not to 'weigh our merits,' but to 'pardon our offences,' &c.; which words carry in them a manifest allusion to that remission of sins which is conceived ordinarily to pertain to this Sacrament, and is expected from it, as one of the benefits of it. But considering that all depends upon our being meet partakers, (whereof God only is the unerring Judge,) and that it becomes every communicant to think humbly of himself, leaning to the modest side; it is very proper to refer the whole to God's clemency, entreating him to accept of us as meet partakers, and thereupon to grant us the remission we came for. For though it is an undoubted truth, that the Eucharist confers remission to the faithful communicant, yet it is right to leave the determination of our faithfulness to God the searcher of hearts, and in the meanwhile to beg forgiveness at his hands. Add to this, that were we ever so certain that we are actually pardoned upon receiving the Eucharist, yet as remission is a continued act, and always progressive, (which I before noted,) it can never be improper to go on with our petitions for it, any more than to make use of the Lord's Prayer every hour of our

lives. It was so used anciently, just after plenary remission [x]: and in like manner we now make use of it, immediately after our having received the Communion; without the least apprehension that such usage interferes at all with the principle which I have been maintaining, as indeed it does not. Nothing is more frequent in the ancient Liturgies, than to ask forgiveness immediately after receiving, though the doctrine of present remission is fully expressed and inculcated in the same Liturgies [y].

Enough hath been said to shew, that our Communion Office supposes remission of sins to be conferred in the Eucharist. The same thing is directly and clearly asserted in our Homilies. 'As to the number of Sacraments, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins, and of our holiness, and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord [z].' Here it is not only supposed that remission is conferred in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but that it could not in strictness be reputed a Sacrament, if it were not so: so great a stress is there laid on this principle. Accordingly, afterwards in the same Homily, absolution is rejected as no Sacrament, having no such promise of remission annexed and tied to the visible sign: and Orders also is rejected, because it 'lacks the promise of remission of

[x] Jerome's remark upon this case, when Baptism and the Eucharist went together, and perfect remission was supposed to have been just granted, is worth noting:

'De Baptismatis fonte surgentes, et regenerati in Dominum Salvatorem . . . statim in prima communione corporis Christi dicunt: et dimitte nobis debita nostra, quae illis fuerant in Christi confessione dimissa. . . . Quamvis sit hominum perfecta conversio, et post vitia atque peccata virtutum plena possessio; numquid possunt sic esse sine vitio, quomodo illi qui statim de Christi fonte procedunt? Et tamen jubentur dicere, dimitte nobis debita nostra, &c. Non humilitatis mendacio, ut tu interpretaris; sed pavore fragilitatis humanae, suam conscientiam formidantis.' Hieronym. Dialog. adv. Pelag. lib. iii. p. 543.

[y] See the Clementine Liturgy quoted above, and compare Fabricius's Collection, pp. 120, 333. Renaudot's, vol. i. p. 51; vol. ii. pp. 42, 152, 174, 212, 233, 253, 269, 447, 634. Mabillon's in Mus. Ital. vol. i. p. 281. Missal. Gall. p. 331. Liturg. Gallic. p. 300.

[z] Homily ix. of Common Prayer and Sacraments, p. 299. Compare Cranmer, p. 46.

sin.' In another Homily, where the Lord's Supper is particularly treated of, it is observed that therein 'the favourable mercies of God are sealed, the satisfaction by Christ towards us confirmed, and the remission of sins established [a].'

After these public authentic evidences of the doctrine of our Church in this particular, it will be needless to add the concurring sentiments of our eminent Divines, all along from that time. But because the point has been sometimes contested, both abroad and at home, and difficulties have been raised, it will be but fair and just to the reader, to set before him the utmost that has been pleaded on the contrary side, and to suggest, as briefly as may be, the proper solutions of the appearing difficulties.

Objections removed.

1. It has been objected, that 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is not itself like Baptism, a rite appointed for the remission of sins; but it is a commemoration only of the all-sufficient sacrifice, which was once offered for an eternal expiation [b].' To which I answer, 1. That supposing this Sacrament were not appointed at all for remission, it does not follow that it must be appointed only for commemoration; because it might be (as it certainly is) appointed in part for sanctification also. 2. Supposing further, that it is not completely equal to Baptism in point of remission, yet it does not follow that it may not confer remission in some measure, or to an inferior degree. 3. It is untruly suggested, that the Eucharist is only a commemoration of the all-sufficient sacrifice, since it most certainly is, as hath been proved, an application of that sacrifice to every worthy receiver: and since remission of sins is one of the fruits

[a] Homily on the worthy receiving, &c. part i. p. 378. The Reformatio Legum, of the same time, says thus: 'Eucharistia Sacramentum est, in quo cibum ex pane sumunt, et potum ex vino, qui convivae sedent in sacra Domini mensa: cujus panis inter illos et vini communicatione, obsignatur gratia Spiritus Sancti, veniaque peccatorum, ad quam ex eo perveniunt, quod fide comprehendunt et percipiunt Christi sacrosanctum corpus, respectu nostrae salutis ad crucem fixum, et cruorem pro tollendis fusum nostris peccatis, ut Dei promissa palam ipsa loquuntur.' De Sacrament. tit. v. c. 4. p. 29.

[b] Dr. Clarke's Posth. Sermons, vol. iv. serm. vi. p. 133.

of that sacrifice, it must, it cannot but be allowed, that the Eucharist carries remission in it, more or less, and to some degree or other.

2. A second objection runs thus: 'To imagine that the Lord's Supper, which is to be repeated perpetually, has such a promise annexed to it of taking away all past sins, as Baptism had, which was to be administered but once, is a dangerous and fatal error, because such an opinion would be plainly an encouragement for men to continue in sin, that the grace of forgiveness might be perpetually repeated and abound [c].' In answer hereto, let but the reader put repentance instead of Lord's Supper, and then traverse the objection over again in his mind, if it be only to see whether the very same objection does not plead as strongly against repeated forgiveness upon repeated repentance, as against the same forgiveness upon repeated communion: for we never suppose any new forgiveness granted in the communion, but upon new repentance. What then have we to trust to, if the plain and comfortable Gospel doctrine of forgiveness (toties quoties) upon true repentance, shall be represented as a dangerous and fatal error, and an encouragement to continue in sins, that grace may abound? It may be true, that such merciful doctrine of forgiveness may carry some appearance of encouragement to sin: so do some other Gospel doctrines; or else St. Paul would have had no need to caution us against 'continuing in sin, that grace may abound [d]:' but nevertheless, it would not only be great presumption, but a fatal error, to draw any such inference from the doctrine of repeated forgiveness upon repeated repentance. For what would have been the consequence, supposing that the rule had run, that if a man sins once, or twice, or a hundred, or a thousand times, and repent as often, he shall be forgiven? Would not many have been tempted to sin on, till they come very near to the utmost verge of forgiveness, before they would think of repenting to purpose? And what scruples might they not raise about the number of sins, or of repentance? And if any man should once go beyond the limits now supposed to be assigned, what would then remain but black

[c] Dr. Clarke, ibid. p. 134.

[d] Rom. vi. 1, 2.

despair, and a hardened resolution to continue in sin? Therefore Divine wisdom has mercifully fixed this matter upon a much better foot, namely, upon one plain rule, that as often as men sin, and truly repent, (without limitation, or number,) so often they shall be forgiven. When evil habits have much and long prevailed, repentance, however sincere, will hardly be completed at once: but the ordinary method is, to repent again and again, after every relapse, till by degrees a man gains the entire mastery over his appetites and passions. In this way, his relapses will grow less frequent, and evil habits less prevalent, and every new repentance will be stronger and stronger, till at length by God's grace, and his own hearty endeavours, he gets the victory, and becomes confirmed in all virtue and godliness. By this we may perceive the use and benefit of frequent forgiveness upon frequent repentances, in a degree suitable and proportionate; that sinners may never want encouragement to go on repenting more and more, after their relapses, and as often sealing their sincere repentances in the blessed Sacrament, to make them the more solemn and the more enduring. But, in the meanwhile, let sinners beware how they tempt the Divine goodness too far, by relapsing: for even repentance, as depending on Divine grace, is so far in God's hands, as well as pardon: and they who presume to sin often, because they may be often forgiven, are in a likely way to come to an end of forgiveness, before they make an end of sinning, and to be taken, at length, in their own snare [e].

Notwithstanding what I have here said, with respect to eucharistical absolution, I would not be construed to mean, that there is no difference at all, in point of remission, between Baptism and the Eucharist: for I am aware that there is some difference, and perhaps considerable. I shall here draw from the ancients, and shall endeavour to point out the difference as

[e] 'Absit ut aliquis ita interpretetur, quasi eo sibi etiam nunc pateat ad delinquendum, quia patet ad poenitendum; et redundantia clementiae caelestis libidinem faciat humanae temeritatis: nemo idcirco deterior sit quia Deus melior est, totiens delinquendo quotiens ignoscitur. Caeterum, finem evadendi habebit, cum offendendi non habebit.' Tertullian. de Poenit. c. vii. p. 126.

clearly and exactly as I can. It was understood to lie in three things chiefly; the extent of the remission, and the certainty, and the perfection of it.

Baptism was conceived to amount to a plenary and certain indulgence for all kinds of sins, were they ever so great; (as for instance, the crucifying of our Lord [f];) and of any number, were they ever so many, or ever so often repeated, provided only they were sincerely repented of, and forsaken at the font: they were from that instant remembered no more [g], either in God's account or the Church's. But as to sins committed after Baptism, if of a grievous kind, (as idolatry, murder, adultery,) or less grievous, but often repeated, or much aggravated by the circumstances, they were judged too heinous to be pardoned in the Eucharist, and the men too vile to be admitted to communion ever after [h]. Not that the church presumed to limit the mercies of God, who searches the hearts, and who could judge of the sincerity of the repentance of such persons: but Church governors of that time would not take upon them to promise such persons peace, upon any professions of repentance whatever, but left them to God only. In short, though they would have given Baptism to any the wickedest Pagans whatever, upon proper professions of repentance, yet they would not give the Eucharist to such as had sinned in like manner after Baptism: which shews that they made some difference between baptismal remission and the eucharistical one, in respect of certainty and extent. When the severity of discipline afterwards relaxed a little, and communion was allowed to all penitents at the hour of death, if not sooner, yet they did not then pretend to be certain that God would absolve the persons, like as they judged with respect to baptismal absolution [i]. Nevertheless, if we distinguish justly upon the two cases, it does not from hence follow, that they thought of any proper disparity between the two absolutions in themselves considered; but strictly speaking, the disparity was supposed to lie

[f] Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. iii. s. 15. p. 47. Cp. Morinus de Poenitent. lib. iii. c. 2, 3.

[g] Vid. Theodoret. in Jerem. xxxi. 34. p. 230.

[h] See Bingham, book xviii. cap. 4. sect. 4.

[i] See Bingham, book xviii. cap. 4. sect. 6. Compare Marshall, Penit. Discipl. p. 111.

in the different malignity of sins committed before Baptism and after. The remedies might be conceived of equal force, other circumstances being equal; but the malady was not the same in both cases.

Another difference between baptismal and eucharistical remission was understood to lie here, that the one perfectly wiped out all past sins; the other, though it healed them, yet left some kind of blots or scars behind it[j]: on account whereof, many who were admitted to lay communion were yet considered as blemished in some measure, and not fit to be admitted afterwards to the sacred offices[k]. No crimes whatever committed before Baptism, and left at the font, were thought any bar or blot for the time to come; Baptism washed all away: but the case was different with respect to sins of a scandalous nature committed after Baptism; for neither repentance nor the Eucharist was conceived to wash off all stain. Hence some made a distinction, upon Psalm xxxii. 1, between perfect remission of sin in Baptism, and the covering it by penance and absolution[l]; that is, by the Eucharist. And others seem to have thought that sins committed before Baptism were perfectly blotted out, as it were, from the book of God's remembrance, as if they had never been, but that sins of any grievous kind committed afterwards, though pardoned upon repentance, should yet be recited, or purged, at the great day[m]: a conjectural presumption, which I will not be bold to warrant.

However, in the whole, it may be admitted, upon the principles of reason, Scripture, and antiquity, that the remission in the Eucharist is not in every respect equal, or similar to the remission in Baptism, because of the different circumstances: nevertheless it is certain, in the general, that there is ordinarily remission in both, as there is ordinarily an application of the merits of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice in both.

[j] Vid. Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. xviii. sect. 20. p. 295. ed. Bened. Athanas. ad Serap. Ep. iv. n. 13. p. 705. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xl. p. 641.

[k] Orig. contr. Cels. lib. iii. sect. 51. p. 482. ed. Bened.

[l] Orig. in Psalm. xxxi. p. 645. Eusebius in Psal. xxxi. p. 120; in Psal. lxxxiv. p. 525.

[m] Vid. Clemens Alex. Strom. iv. num. 24. pp. 633, 634; Strom. vi. p. 795. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xv. n. 23. pp. 236, 237.

I must now further add, that the objection made against repeated forgiveness, upon repeated repentance in the Eucharist, would have been of much greater force than it really now is, were it not that this holy Sacrament appears to have been appointed as the strongest security against those very abuses which men are prone to make of the Divine mercy. The two principal abuses are, first, the putting off repentance from day to day, fixing no time for it, as it is thought to be left at large, and to be acceptable at any time; next, the resting content with a lame, partial, or unsincere repentance: against both which the appointment of this holy Sacrament is a kind of standing provision, the best, it may be, that the nature of the case would admit of. To those who are apt to procrastinate, or loiter, it is an awakening call, obliging them the more strongly to fix upon some certain and determinate time for repentance: and to the superficial penitents, it is a kind of solemn lecture of sincerity and carefulness, under pain of being found guilty of trampling under foot the body and blood of Christ. And while it promises forgiveness to all that worthily receive, and to none else, it becomes a strong incitement to break off sins without delay, and to be particularly watchful and careful for the time to come. So far is the doctrine of remission in the Eucharist (when justly stated) from being any encouragement to sin, that it is quite the reverse, being indeed one of the strongest encouragements to a good life. But I proceed.

3. Socinus and his followers appear much offended at the doctrine of remission in the Eucharist, (for fear, I presume, of admitting any merits of Christ's death,) and they labour all possible ways to run it down; sometimes misrepresenting it, sometimes ridiculing it, and sometimes putting on an air of grave reasoning. Socinus himself was content to throw a blunt censure upon it, as bordering upon idolatry [n]. An injurious reflection, for which there was no colour; unless he first

[n] 'Plerique ipsorum in hisce quidem regionibus credunt se, illa digne obeunda, suorum peccatorum veniam et remissionem consequi: haud valde diversum ab eo quod Papistae sentiunt, qui eam propterea in sacrificium pro vivis et mortuis transformarunt, et idolum quoddam ex ea fecerunt.' Socin. Quod. Regn. Polon. p. 701.

wilfully perverted the meaning, and falsely charged the Protestants with the opus operatum.

Smalcius plainly put that false construction upon it, and then took the handle to ridicule it, as if any remission could be extracted from the use of such common things as the bare symbols are [o]. So ridiculous a mistake of the doctrine which he opposed, either shewed no quickness of apprehension, or no sincerity. Schlictingius followed the same blunder, and still with greater levity [p]: a certain argument, that he had no solid reasons to produce on that head. The Racovian Catechism of the first Latin edition, (A.D. 1609,) pleaded, that a man ought to be sure of his pardon [q] in heaven, before he takes the Sacrament, and therefore could have no more pardon to receive here: that must be their meaning, if they intended it for an argument. However, the argument at best is a very lame one. For whatever certainty of that nature any man may pretend to, it is capable of being renewed and reinforced by repeated assurances: and as we are taught continually to pray for forgiveness, so may we receive it continually, both in the Word and Sacraments; but more particularly in the Sacraments. In the next edition of that Catechism, (A.D. 1659,) that trifling plea was struck out, and another was substituted in its room; which is to this effect, that remission cannot be conferred in the Eucharist, because commemoration only, and not remission, was the end of that rite by our Lord's account of it [r]. But here the suggestion is not true; for our Lord himself has sufficiently intimated, (as I have before proved,) that remission of sins is one end of that service,

[o] 'Quis enim de sua carne, cum omnibus concupiscentiis, crucifigenda cogitet, si usus panis et vini, qui quotidie obvius est, possit remissionem peccatorum, &c. consequi?' Smalc. contr. Frantz. p. 333.

[p] 'O facilem vero et expeditam adipiscendae salutis rationem, si tot tantaque bona, mica panis, et gutta vini possis consequi.' Schlicting. contr. Meisner. p. 799.

[q] 'Qui vult digne coenae Domini participare, eum de remissione peccatorum, ex parte Dei, certum ac fide confirmatum esse oportet.' Racov. Catech. c. iii.

[r] 'Cum is finis ritus istius usurpandi sit, ut beneficium a Christo nobis praestitum commemoremus, seu annuntiemus, nec ullus alius praeter hunc sit a Christo indicatus finis; apparet, non eo institutum esse ut aliquid illic beneficii, aliter quam quatenus digne observatus pietatis Christianae pars est, a Christo sumamus.' Racov. Catech. c. iv. sect. 6. p. 230.

in the very words of the institution [s]: and if he had not so plainly said it, the very nature of the act proclaims it, taking in what St. Paul has taught. There are more ends than one to be served by the same Sacrament, whether it be of Baptism or of the Eucharist: and all are consistent, because allied and subordinate. Not to mention that commemoration itself, rightly considered, strongly infers and implies present benefits; as I have observed above [t]. Moreover the Socinians themselves are forced to allow other ends of the Sacrament, over and above the commemoration of Christ's death: namely, a declaration of their communion with Christ their head, and with their Christian brethren; besides a further declaration of their spiritual feeding upon Christ, then and at all times, and of their looking upon his death as the seal of the covenant, and upon his doctrine as the food of the soul. Now if they think themselves at liberty to invent as many ends as they please, such as may suit with their other principles, why are we debarred from admitting such other ends of the Sacrament as Scripture plainly points out to us, and the reason also of the thing manifestly requires? From hence then it appears that the Socinian pleas in this case carry more of artificial management in them than of truth or sobriety.

However, it is visible from the last citation, that one principal drift is, to exclude God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and all Divine influences, out of the Sacrament, and to make nothing more of it than a performance of man: and in this view they are content to account it a part of Christian piety. Ruarus, one of the shrewdest and learnedest of them, disliked their granting so much, and charged them, in a note of correction [u], with an inconsistency in saying it: because every pious observance contributes, in some measure, towards remission of sins, and they had before absolutely denied any benefit at all that way. Schlictingius left this note of Ruarus without any reply; though he replied to

[s] Matth. xxvi. 28.

[t] See above, p. 71.

[u] 'Si pars est Christianae pietatis, utique ad justificationem, atque ita ad remissionem peccatorum nobis prodest: quod tamen in initio quaestionis hujus, simpliciter negatum fuit.' Ruari Notae, p. 27.

several others which went along with it: which shews, either that he found it impossible to evade the doctrine of remission in this Sacrament, unless it were at the expense of self-contradiction; or else, that he was willing, at length, to admit of it, provided only they may claim remission as their due reward for the service, and not as indulged them for the merits of Christ's death and sacrifice therein commemorated. It must be owned, that Ruarus's hint on that head was acute, and came home to the purpose: for, as those men supposed all other requisites for remission to be implied in worthy receiving, and now added this part of Christian piety to the rest, it must of consequence follow, that remission of sins is granted upon it, by their own principles. So then, in the last result, they and we may seem to be nearly agreed as to the point of remission in or upon this service; and the only remaining difference will be about the meritorious cause of it: and that will resolve into another question, discussed, in some measure, above; namely, the question concerning the value, virtue, and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ.

4. There is an insidious way made use of, by some of our Socinians, for the undermining the doctrine of remission in the Eucharist: they depreciate the service, and the preparation proper to it, making both so slight, that no man could justly expect so Divine a grant from so contemptible a performance: 'I know not,' says one, 'to what purpose so many superstitious books are written to teach men to prepare themselves for the memorial supper, when an honest intention and a reverent performance are sufficient both preparations and qualifications for and in all Gospel ordinances [v].' Here is no mention of faith, nor of repentance from dead works; without which, undoubtedly, there can be no remission of sins, whether in the Sacrament or out of it. The proper answer to this pretence will fall under the head of worthy receiving, in a distinct chapter below. In the meanwhile, let it be considered, whether they who require sincere repentance as a necessary qualification for the holy Communion, or they who labour to defeat that most excellent end

[v] The Argument of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church, part i. p. 12; printed A.D. 1697.

and use of it, do most consult the true interest of religion and virtue; which the Socinians would be thought much to befriend in what they teach on this head.

I intended here to have closed this chapter, till it came into my mind that we have had some kind of dispute with the Romanists also, (as well as Socinians,) upon the point of remission in the Eucharist. For the Romanists, as it seems, being apprehensive, that if the people be taught to expect pardon from God in receiving the Communion, they will think they need no other, and that thereupon masses, and indulgences, and other absolutions will sink in their value; I say, the Romanists considering this, have contrived, that venial sins only shall be pardoned upon reception of the Eucharist, but that mortal sins shall be remitted another way. Chemnitius, in his Examen, has taken notice of this matter, and charged it upon them with very little ceremony[w]. Bellarmine, in reply, could not deny the main charge, as to their confining the eucharistical remission to venial sins only, or to mortal ones unknown; but passing over the secret reasons or motives for the doctrine, he employs all his wit and learning to give the fairest colours to it[x]. Gerhard came after, and defended Chemnitius in that article, confuting Bellarmine[y]. I perceive not that the learned cardinal, with all his acuteness, was able to prove anything with respect to the main question, more than this, (which has been allowed above,) that Baptism is emphatically, or eminently, the Sacrament of remission, and the Eucharist of spiritual growth: and while he is forced to acknowledge that venial sins are remitted in the

[w] 'Remissionem peccatorum graviorum et mortalium, quae post Baptismum commissa sunt, docent quaerendam et impetrandam esse nostra contritione, confessione, satisfactione, sacrificio missae, et aliis modis. Vident autem totam illam veniarum structuram collapsuram, si remissio illa et reconciliatio quaeratur in corpore et sanguine Christi. Ne tamen nihil tribuant Eucharistiae, loquuntur de venialibus, hoc est, sicut Jesuitae interpretantur, de levioribus et minutioribus peccatis. Ut igitur satisfactionis suas et reliquas veniarum nundinationes retineant acerbe dimicant, in vero usu Eucharistiae non fieri applicationem remissionis peccatorum.' Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trident. part ii. p. 70.

[x] Bellarmin. tom. iii. lib. iv. de Eucharist. c. 17, 18, 19.

[y] Gerhard. Loc. Comm. tom. v. de Sacr. Coen. c. xx. p. 175, &c. Compare Vines, Treatise of the Lord's Supper, p. 328; printed A.D. 1657.

Eucharist, and unknown mortal ones, as often as necessary[z], it is obvious to perceive, that it was not any love of truth, or strength of argument on that side, which withheld him from granting more. His strongest plea, which all the rest do in a manner resolve into, is no more than this; that as the worthy communicant is supposed to bring with him true faith and sincere repentance to the Lord's table, he comes pardoned thither, and can have no pardon to take out there upon his receiving the Eucharist. I mention not how the argument recoils upon his own hypothesis. The true answer is, that the grace of remission, or justification, is progressive, and may be always improving, as before noted[a]: and whatever pardon we may conceive ourselves to be entitled to before, or to be then in possession of, yet it is no slight advantage to have the same solemnly renewed, established, ratified, and sealed in the holy Communion, by a formal application there made of the merits of the grand atonement, in which only, after our performing the conditions, our remission stands.

CHAP. X.

Of the Sanctifying Grace of the Holy Spirit conferred in the EUCHARIST.

The Greek *χάρις*, the Latin *gratia*, the English *grace*, is a word of some latitude, admitting of various acceptations: I need not mention all, but such only as are most for our present

[z] 'Posset etiam dici Eucharistiam applicare haereditatem, etiam quantum ad remissionem peccatorum, sed tum solum cum ea est necessaria; nimirum cum ii qui non indigne accedunt, habent aliqua peccata mortalia, quorum tamen conscientiam non habent.' Bellarm. ibid. c. xix. p. 655.

[a] See above, p. 217. Bishop Taylor's doctrine on this head, as it lies scattered in distant pages, may be worth noting. 'Justification and sanctification are continued acts: they are like the issues of a fountain into its receptacles. God is always giving, and we are always receiving.' Worthy Comm. p. 43. 'The Sacrament ministers pardon, as pardon is ministered in this world, by parts. ... In the usual methods of God, pardon is proportionable to our repentance.' p. 52. 'If we find that we increase in duty, then we may look upon the tradition of the sacramental symbols, as a direct consignation of pardon. Not that it is completed: for it is a work of time; it is as long a doing, as repentance is perfecting. ... It is then working: and if we go on in duty, God will proceed to finish his methods of grace, &c. ... And this he is pleased, by the Sacrament, all the way to consign.' p. 74.

purpose. Grace, in the general, signifies favour, mercy, indulgence, bounty: in particular, it signifies a gift, and more especially a spiritual gift, and in a sense yet more restrained, the gift of sanctification, or of such spiritual aids as may enable a man both to will and to do according to what God has commanded. The last which I have named appears to be the most prevailing acceptation of the word grace at this day, derived from ancient usage, and common consent, which gives the law to forms of speech, and to the interpretation thereof. The use of the word in the New Testament is various, sometimes larger, sometimes stricter, often doubtful which. I will not be positive, as to several texts where the word grace occurs, and seemingly in the strict sense, that they must necessarily be taken according to such precise meaning, and can bear no larger, or no other construction: as where the 'grace of our Lord Jesus Christ' is spoken of [b]; or where grace, mercy, and peace are implored [c]; or grace and peace [d]; or where the grace of God is mentioned [e]. In several texts of that sort, the word grace may be understood in the stricter sense, but may also admit of the larger: in which, however, the grace of sanctification must be included among others. The texts which seem to be most expressive of the limited sense, now in use, are such as these: 'Great grace was upon them all [f].' 'The grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia [g].' 'My grace is sufficient for thee [h].' 'Grow in grace [i].' 'Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably [j].' 'God giveth grace unto the humble [k].' In these and the like places, the word grace, most probably, signifies what we now commonly mean by that name: or if any larger meaning be supposed, yet it is certainly inclusive of the other, signifying that and more. It is not very material whether we

[b] Rom. xvi. 20, 24. 1 Cor. xvi. 23. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Gal. vi. 18. Phil. iv. 23. 1 Thess. v. 28. 2 Thess. iii. 18. Philem. 25. Revel. xxii. 21.

[c] 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. Tit. i. 4. 2 John 3.

[d] 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Pet. i. 2. Revel. i. 4.

[e] Acts xiii. 43; xiv. 26; xv. 40; xx. 24. 1 Cor. i. 4; iii. 10; xv. 10. 2 Cor. i. 12; vi. 1. Ephes. iii. 7. Tit. ii. 11. 1 Pet. iv. 10.

[f] Acts iv. 33; compare verse 31.

[g] 2 Cor. viii. 1.

[h] 2 Cor. xii. 9.

[i] 2 Pet. iii. 18.

[j] Heb. xii. 28.

[k] Jam. iv. 6. 1 Pet. v. 5.

understand the word grace, in the New Testament, in the comprehensive or restrained sense, since it would be disputing only about words or names. The sanctifying operations of the Holy Spirit of God upon the minds of men may be abundantly proved from the New Testament: and so it is of less moment to inquire what names they go under, while we are certain of the things. The phrase 'of grace,' or 'sanctifying grace,' is sufficiently warranted by its ancient standing in the Church [l], so that I need not dwell longer upon it, but may proceed directly to shew, that what we commonly call the grace of sanctification is conferred in the Eucharist.

1. I argue, first, from the participation of Christ's death, with its fruits, in the Eucharist, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16, insinuated also in the words of the institution, as explained at large in a chapter above. They who so partake of Christ, do of course partake of the Spirit of Christ: it cannot be otherwise upon Christian principles taught in the New Testament. If any man is Christ's, he has the Spirit of God dwelling in Him [m]. And this Spirit is the source and fountain of righteousness and true holiness [n]. And no one can be made an acceptable offering unto God, but he who is first sanctified by the Holy Spirit [o].

2. The same thing will be proved, by undeniable consequence, from our Lord's doctrine of the import of spiritual feeding laid down in John vi. For since it has been before shewn, that they who do receive worthily do spiritually feed upon Christ, and are thereby made partakers of all the privileges thereto belonging, it plainly follows that they must have Christ dwelling in them [p]; and if Christ, they have the Spirit also of Christ, who is inseparable from him. Therefore the sanctification of the Spirit is conveyed in the Eucharist, along with the other spiritual blessings, which suppose and imply it, and cannot be understood without it, upon Scripture principles.

[l] See some account of the ecclesiastical use of the word grace, in Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, p. 519, &c. Vossius, Histor. Pelag. lib. iii. par. i. Thes. ii. Joh. Just. Von Einem. Select. Animadv. ad Joh. Clerici Scripta, p. 761, &c. Magdeb. 1735.

[m] Rom. viii. 9. 1 Cor. vi. 17.

[n] Rom. viii. 10, 14. 1 Cor. vi. 11. 2 Thess. ii. 13.

[o] Rom. xv. 16.

[p] John vi. 56.

3. A further argument may be drawn from the known analogy there is between the two Sacraments, taken together with those several texts which speak directly of the sanctification of the Spirit conferred in Baptism[q]; or an argument may be drawn a fortiori, in this manner: if the putting on Christ (which is done in Baptism) carries with it a conveyance of the Holy Spirit; much more does the eating or drinking Christ, which is done in the Eucharist.

4. But to argue yet more directly, (though indirect arguments, where the connection is clear and certain, as in this case, are not the less conclusive,) we may next draw a proof of the same doctrine from the express words of St. Paul, where he says, 'By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body—and have been all made to drink into one Spirit[r].' That is to say, by one and the same Spirit before spoken of[s], we Christians (as many of us as are so more than in name) are in Baptism made one mystical body of Christ, and have been all made to drink of the sacramental cup in the Eucharist; whereby the same Spirit hath again united us, yet more perfectly, to Christ our head, in the same mystical body. Such appears to be the natural and obvious sense of the place: which accordingly has been so understood by judicious interpreters, ancient[t] and modern[u]. I shall not dissemble it, that several ancient interpreters, as well as some moderns, have understood the whole text of Baptism only; interpreting the former part of the outward washing, and the latter part of the Spirit accompanying it[v]. But, it seems, they did not well consider, that the concurrence of the Spirit in Baptism had been sufficiently insinuated before in the former part of the verse; 'By one Spirit are we all baptized,' &c. And therefore to interpret Spirit again of the same Sacrament, appears to border too nearly upon tautology: neither did they sufficiently reflect, how harsh a figure that of drinking is, if

[q] John iii. 5. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Ephes. v. 26. Tit. iii. 5.

[r] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[s] 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11.

[t] Chrysostom. in loc. tom. v. p. 324. ed. Paris. Damascen. in loc.

[u] Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, Gerhard, Grotius, Gataker, Hammond, Locke, Wells. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. lib. v. cap. 7. pp. 109, 114.

[v] Pelagius, under the name of Jerome; and Hilary the deacon, under the name of Ambrose: as likewise Theophylact in loc., and perhaps more.

applied to Baptism; when putting on the Spirit (as is elsewhere said of Christ, with respect to that Sacrament[w]) might have been much more proper. They may seem also to have forgot, or not to have considered, how suitable and pertinent it was to the Apostle's argument, to refer to both Sacraments in that place, as I shall now make appear.

It might be highly proper, and much to the purpose, when the Apostle was mentioning Baptism, as one bond of mystical union, to take notice also of the Eucharist, as another; which it certainly was, according to his own doctrine in the same Epistle[x]. Indeed, it might be thought a kind of omission, and in some measure diminishing the force of his argument in this place, had he referred but to one Sacrament, when there was just occasion, or the like occasion, for referring to both. His design was to set forth the inviolable union of Christians, and to represent the several ties by which they were bound together. He knew that the Eucharist was a strong cement of that mystical union, as well as the other Sacrament; for he had himself declared as much, by saying elsewhere, 'We being many are one body, being all partakers of that one bread.' It was therefore very natural here again to take notice of the Eucharist, when he was enumerating the bonds of union, and amongst them particularly the Sacrament of Baptism, which would obviously lead to the mentioning this other Sacrament. Accordingly, he has briefly and elegantly made mention of this other, in the words 'made to drink into one Spirit.' Where made to drink, but in the Eucharist? He had formerly signified the mystical union under the emblem of one loaf: and now he chooses to signify the same again under the emblem of one cup, (an emblem, wherein Ignatius, within fifty years after, seems to have followed him[y],) both belonging to one and the same Eucharist, both referring to one and the same mystical head. Dr. Claget well argues against the Romanists from this text, as follows: 'St. Paul thought the observation of the two institutions of our Saviour (viz. Baptism and the Communion of the holy table) was a sufficient proof that

[w] Gal iii. 27. [x] 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

[y] Ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. Ignat. ad Philadelph cap. 4.

believers were one body: and we have reason to believe, that if he had known there were other Sacraments—he would not have omitted the mention of them here, where he proves the unity of the Church by Baptism and communion of the body and blood of Christ. It is something to our purpose, that St. Paul owns no more than these, where he industriously proves that Christians are one body by these [z].' If this reasoning be just, as it appears to be, and if St. Paul knew (as he certainly did know) that the Eucharist has some share in making Christians one body, as well as the other Sacrament, it manifestly follows that he could not well omit the mention of it in this place. I should take notice, that our very judicious Archbishop Sharpe has pressed the same argument, in a fuller and still stronger manner, from the same text [a]; and that the Protestants in general have made the like use of the text in their disputes with the Romanists, against multiplying Sacraments, or against mutilating the Sacrament of the Eucharist by taking away the cup from it [b]. So that besides commentators, in great numbers, thus interpreting this text, there is the concurring judgment of many or most Protestant Divines confirming the same construction.

Nevertheless, Socinus, having formed a project to throw off water-baptism, laboured extremely to elude the interpretation before mentioned. He considered, that if the latter part of it were interpreted of the external service of the Eucharist, then the former part must of course be understood of external Baptism: besides that he was not willing to allow that any inward grace went along with either Sacrament. Such were his motives for eluding the true meaning of this text: his pretexts, or colourings, were as here follow:

1. He pleaded, that partaking of the Eucharist is never once represented in the New Testament by that particular part of it, the drinking. He acknowledges that the whole Service is some-

[z] Claget, vol. i. Serm. x. p. 263.

[a] Sharpe, vol. vii. Serm. v. vi. p. 106. &c. Serm. x. p. 230.

[b] 'Nihil obstat quo minus synecdochice hoc loco potionis ac poculi nomine explicetur Eucharistia, (quod Protestantes omnes merito ex hoc loco pertendunt, contra substractionem calicis in Communione Romana,) ac alibi per solam panis fractionem designatur. Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7.' Maresius, Hydra Socinianismi, tom. iii. p. 835.

times signified by the other part, (the nobler part, in his judgment,) viz. the eating, or breaking bread; but that it should be signified by drinking only, the meaner part of the Sacrament, he could not be persuaded to allow [c].

But he seems to me to have been over delicate in this matter, and more scrupulous than need required. For, since the whole Service (as he is forced to confess) may be signified by one part, while the other is understood; why not by the drinking, as well as by the eating? Or why must the eating be looked upon as the nobler and better part of the two, in this instance especially, when the blood of Christ (the most precious blood of Christ, so much spoken of in the New Testament) is the thing signified [d]? But supposing the eating, or the meat, to be the nobler of the two, then the New Testament, one would think, has paid a proper respect to it, by denominating the whole from it more than once; though taking the liberty to pay some regard also to the other part, by denominating the whole from it once at least, if no more. The Apostle might have particular reasons for doing it here, because, having mentioned washing just before, as belonging to one Sacrament, he might think that drinking would best answer to it in the other Sacrament, as water and wine are more analogous than water and bread [e]. Or since the Apostle had signified Christian unity before [f], under the emblem of sacramental meat, he might choose the rather now to represent the same unity under the emblem of sacramental drink, being that there is as properly one cup, as there is one loaf.

2. Socinus and Volkelius further plead, that had the Apostle intended to speak of the Lord's Supper, he would have used the

[c] 'Cur quaeso Paulus coenam Dominicam cum Baptismo collaturus potionis tantum mentionem fecisset, non etiam comestionis, sive cibi, quae praecipua ex duabus quodammodo coenae illius partibus censenda est, et cujus solius nomine alicubi tota coena intelligitur, ut 1 Cor. xi. 33. ... Frequentissime in Sacris Literis solius cibi, aut etiam panis mentione facta, ipse quoque potus intelligitur: id quod, saltem in coena Domini, nunquam potionis solius nomine fieri contingit.' Socin. de Bapt. Aquae, cap. viii. Cp. Volkel. de Ver. Relig. lib. vi. cap. 14. p. 684, alias 835.

[d] It may be noted, that the ancients, when they made any distinction, supposed the cup, the drinking, to be the nobler part of the two, as being the finishing and perfecting part. See Salmasius de Transubstantiatione contr. Grot. pp. 280–284.

[e] Cp. Hoornbeeck, Socin. Confut. tom. iii. p. 381.

[f] 1 Cor. x. 17.

word ποτιζόμεθα, to denote the time present, not ἐποτίσθημεν, which refers to time past: for the Lord's Supper is what Christians continually partake of with repeated attendance, and so is never wholly past or done with, like Baptism, which is but once submitted to[g].

Now, in answer to this reasoning, I shall not insist, as I justly might, upon the known latitude of the aorists, which are indefinite as to time; nor upon any enallage of tenses, which is frequent in Scripture; but allowing that St. Paul is to be understood of the time past, in that instance, I say, it is no just objection against interpreting the text of the Eucharist. The Apostle is there speaking of the union of Christians as then actually subsisting, and therefore made before he spake of it; made by Baptism and the Lord's Supper, considered as previous to that union, and therefore past. He had nothing to do with future communions, so far as his argument was concerned: none but past communions could have any share in making or strengthening that union, which subsisted before he spake of it. Therefore it might be proper in both the instances, to make use of a verb of the preter tense, referring to time past. Communions which are not, or only will be, or may be, unite nothing, effect nothing in the mean season, but would have been foreign to the Apostle's argument, which looked only to what had been done, and had had its effect already upon the union then subsisting. The Eucharist in that view was a thing past, as much as Baptism; and so the verbs in both instances were rightly chosen, and aptly answer to each other[h]: We have been all baptized, and We have been all made to drink[i], &c.

[g] 'Si Paulus coenam Dominicam intellexisset, non verbo praeteriti temporis "potavimus," sed "potamus" praesentis usus fuisset: cum ea coena non a quolibet Christiano homine plane et omnino jam manducata fuerit aliquando, sed identidem in posterum, ubi facultas detur, manducari debeat.' Socinus de Bapt. Aquae, cap. viii. pp. 88, 89.

'Adde quod non "potavimus," sed "potamus" dixisset, si de coena Dominica locutus fuisset. ... Actiones quippe quas semel perfecisse satis est, praeteriti potius quam praesentis temporis verbo exprimi solent: haec vero, cum et in posterum, qualibet se offerente occasione peragenda sit, rectius et communi consuetudini loquendi convenientius praesentis temporis verbo effertur.' Volkelius, lib. vi. cap. 14. p. 685, alias 836.

[h] Cp. Hoornbeeck, tom. iii. p. 387. Maresius Hydra, tom. iii. p. 836.

[i] Πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν ... πάντες εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. As to some few copies here reading πόμα for πνεῦμα, I refer to Dr. Mill,

3. Socinus and Volkelius further urge, (which looks the most like an argument of anything they have,) that the Apostle, in that chapter, refers only to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and therefore cannot reasonably be understood either of Baptism or the Eucharist, which were common to all Christians, and not to the gifted only[j]. But it is unfortunate for this objection, that the Apostle should so emphatically word it twice over, We have all &c., as it were on purpose to prevent its being understood to relate to the gifted only. The universality of the Apostle's expression is a much stronger argument for interpreting him of the Sacraments, than anything else in the context can be for understanding the words of the extraordinary gifts: for it is plain, and is on all hands confessed, that the extraordinary gifts were not common to all, or to many, but rather peculiar to a few only in comparison. But to answer more directly to the pretence drawn from the context, it may be observed, that the design of the Apostle in that chapter does not only well suit with the interpretation we contend for, but is better cleared upon that foot than upon any other. His design was to prevent, as much as possible, any emulation between the gifted and ungifted brethren. How does he execute it? By representing how many things were common to all, and how far all of them participated of the Spirit, one way or other. 1. They all owned Christ Jesus for their Lord, which none could do 'but by the Holy Ghost[k];' therefore they were so far upon a level, with respect to the favour of the Holy Spirit. 2. Those extraordinary gifts, imparted to a few, were really intended for the common benefit of the whole body: they were given to every one of the gifted, to profit others withal[l]. The same Spirit was present to the whole Church, to all true members of it, in both Sacraments[m]; so that they did not only reap the benefits of what the gifted men did, but they

who vindicates the present reading. But the sense might be the same either way, because the preceding words, 'by one Spirit,' might be applied to both parts of the sentence.

[j] 'De donis spiritualibus; ut unicuique totum caput accurate legenti constare poterit.' Socinus, cap. viii. p. 84. 'Paulus isto in loco de variis Spiritus Sancti donis disserit, quibus Deus per Filium suum primam illam Ecclesiam mirum in modum locupletaverat.' Volkelius, lib. vi. cap. 14. p. 675, alias 815.

[k] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [l] 1 Cor. xii. 7.

[m] 1 Cor. xii. 13.

had themselves an immediate communion with the self-same Spirit, in as useful, though not altogether so glaring a way. 4. However pompous those shining gifts might appear, and be apt to dazzle, yet there were other gifts more excellent [n] by far than they, and common to all good Christians; namely, the gifts of faith, hope, and charity [o], from the same Spirit [p]. Such appears to be the scope and connection of the Apostle's discourse in that chapter and the chapter following: and it is so far from proving that the text which we are now considering belongs not to the Sacraments, that, on the contrary, it very much confirms that construction [q].

Enough, I presume, hath been said for the vindicating our construction of this text against the forced glosses and unnatural evasions of Socinus and his followers: though some of them, either more acute or more ingenuous than the rest, have not scrupled to give up the new construction, so far as to understand the text of both Sacraments [r].

The construction of the text being thus far fixed and settled, it remains now that we draw the just conclusion from it, and so wind up our argument. If the drinking of the sacramental cup is drinking into one Spirit, the Spirit of God, then the Eucharist, duly administered and duly received, is a medium by which we ordinarily partake of the same Spirit, and consequently of the sanctifying gifts or graces of the Spirit. By this we understand, how he that is joined unto Christ our Lord is one spirit [s] with him: because that Spirit who is essentially one with him is sacramentally united with us. And as Christ dwelleth in all those who spiritually feed upon him [t], so are all such the temple of the Holy Ghost [u]; and while they are so, they are sanctified

[n] 1 Cor. xii. 31.

[o] 1 Cor. xiii. 1–13.

[p] That appears to be insinuated by the Apostle there: but elsewhere he expressly teaches, that all such Christian virtues are the fruits of the Spirit. Gal. v. 22. Ephes. v. 9.

[q] Compare Clem. Alexandrin. Paedag. lib. i. cap. 11. pp. 106, 107.

[r] 'Nec ausim multum ab iis dissentire, qui in istis verbis non ad Baptismum tantum, sed ad coenam Domini quoque respici putant: utrumque enim institutum nos tam ad unitatem et communionem unius corporis Ecclesiae accedere, quam in unitate corporis ejusdem manere testatur.' Sam. Przipcovius in loc. p. 93.

[s] 1 Cor. vi. 17.

[t] John vi. 56.

[u] 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Ephes. ii. 21, 22. 1 Pet. ii. 5.

both in body and soul. Such sanctification carries in it all that the Scripture reckons up among the fruits of the Spirit, as enriching the soul[v]; and likewise all that concerns the immortalizing of the body[x], and sealing the whole man to future glory[y]. All these blessings and privileges are conferred in the Eucharist, to them who receive worthily; because the Spirit is conferred in it, who is the fountain of them all, and whose gracious presence supposes them.

In confirmation of what hath been advanced upon Scripture principles, it may now be proper to descend to Fathers, who had the same Scriptures before them, and whose sentiments, if concurring, may be of use to give us the more abundant satisfaction in the present article. I have occasionally, in the course of these papers, cited several passages which speak expressly or implicitly of sanctification, as conferred in or by the Eucharist. I shall not here repeat the same at full length, but shall throw them together in a summary way, to serve as hints for recollection. What has been cited above[z] from Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus, of the beneficial nature of the Sacrament, necessarily infers or implies the graces of the Holy Spirit.

Clemens of Alexandria, upon another occasion, has been cited, expressly saying that they who receive the Eucharist with faith are 'sanctified both in body and soul[a].' Tertullian says, that the body is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the 'soul may be replenished with God[b].' In like manner, Origen asserts, that the Eucharist does sanctify them that 'use it as they ought[c].' The same thing is intimated by Cyprian of that time, under some variety of expression[d]. Cyril of Jerusalem expressly says, that the heavenly bread and salutary cup 'sanctify both body and soul[e].' Gaudentius Brixiensis, whom I have not quoted before, says of the Eucharistical food, that it 'sanctifies

[v] Gal. v. 22. Ephes. v. 9.
[x] Rom. viii. 10, 11.
[y] 2 Cor. i. 22. Ephes. i. 13, 14; iv. 30.
[z] See above, pp. 101, 141–147.
[a] Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. cap. 2 p. 178. See above, cap. vii. p. 148.
[b] Tertullian. de Resurr. Carn. cap. viii. p. 330. See above, cap. vii. p. 152.
[c] Origen. in Matt. p. 254. Contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 766. See above, cap. v. pp. 85, 86.
[d] Cyprian. Ep. 54, 63. See above, cap. vii. p. 155.
[e] Cyrill. Hieros. Mystag. iv. p. 321. See above, cap. vii. p. 158.

even them who consecrate it[f].' Lastly, Cyril of Alexandria maintains, that faithful communicants are 'sanctified by being partakers of the holy flesh and precious blood of Christ, the Saviour of us all[g].' These testimonies might suffice to shew how unanimous the ancients were, in asserting sanctification, as conferred in the Eucharist.

But for the further confirmation or illustration of this particular, I shall now proceed to consider what the ancients taught concerning the descent or illapse of the Holy Spirit upon the symbols or upon the communicants in this holy solemnity. Which I the rather choose to do, that I may at the same time clear up that important article, in some measure, and remove some common mistakes.

To give the reader a just idea of the whole thing, it will be necessary to begin with the Sacrament of Baptism, wherein the like descent or illapse of the Holy Ghost was expected, and where the like invocation obtained very early; sooner, I conceive, than in the service of the Eucharist, so far as may be judged from the records now remaining. The form of Baptism, probably, might give the first handle for it, as it ran in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Or, there appeared sufficient warrant in the New Testament for beseeching God to send the Holy Spirit, since our Lord had promised that his heavenly Father would 'give the Holy Spirit to them that would ask him[h].' Where could they more properly ask it than in their Sacramental Offices, in that of Baptism especially, when the New Testament makes such frequent mention of the Holy Spirit, as assisting to it, or presiding in it[i]? Indeed, we find no express mention in the New Testament of any ordinary descent or illapse of the Spirit in either Sacrament, nor any direct precept for a special invocation of that kind: neither can we be certain of apostolical practice as to that particular. The custom might

[f] 'Consecrantes sanctificat consecratus.' Gaudent. Brix. de Exod. ii. p. 806.

[g] 'Αγιαζόμεθα μέτοχοι γενόμενοι τῆς τε ἁγίας σαρκὸς, καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ. Cyrilli et Synod. Alexandr. Epist. apud Binium, vol. ii. p. 210. Cp. Theophil. Alexandrin. Pasch. 1. inter Opp. Hieron. tom. iv. p. 698.

[h] Luke xi. 13.

[i] See above, in this chapter, p. 241.

commence in the apostolical age, or it might come in later: but whenever it commenced, it seems to have been grounded upon such Scripture principles as I have just now hinted.

Tertullian (about A. D. 200) is, I think, the first who speaks anything plainly and fully to this matter[k]. He supposes that ever since 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters[l],' all waters have been privileged for receiving the Spirit, and becoming signs and instruments of sanctification, upon prayer made to God: particularly, in Baptism, after prayer has been sent up, the Holy Ghost comes down upon the waters, and sanctifies them, yea and gives them a sanctifying quality. But he supposes the angel of Baptism to be sent beforehand[m], to prepare the way for the reception of the Spirit; which he endeavours to illustrate from some resembling cases in the New Testament[n]. After the angel's performing his part[o] upon the waters, the Holy Spirit descended in person on the parties coming to be baptized, and rested, as it were, upon the waters[p]. So writes our author: and the true meaning or result of all is, that the Holy Spirit, by his coming, sanctifies the persons in the use of those waters, or use of that service[q]. Allowances must be made for something of

[k] 'Omnes aquae de pristina originis praerogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo: supervenit enim statim Spiritus de caelis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso; et ita sanctificatae vim sanctificandi combibunt.' Tertullian. de Baptism. cap. iv. p. 225.

[l] Gen. i. 2.

[m] Tertull. ibid. cap. vi. 'Angelus Baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum, quam fides impetrat, obsignata in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto.' p. 226.

[n] John v. 4. Matt. iii. 3.

[o] It is frequent with the ancients to speak of the offices of angels, which they supposed to be employed in ministering to God for the heirs of salvation, according to Heb. i. 14. And according to their respective offices, they assigned them names, having no other rule to go by. So they sometimes mention, besides the angel of Baptism, (which means any or every angel so employed,) the angel also of prayer, angel of repentance, angel of peace, and angel of light, or the like: such manner of speaking and thinking was just and innocent, till the succeeding abuses by angel-worship made it almost necessary for wise men to lay it aside.

[p] 'Tunc ille sanctissimus Spiritus super emundata et benedicta corpora libens a Patre descendit, super Baptismi aquas, tanquam pristinam sedem recognoscens conquiescit, columbae figura dilapsus in Dominum, ut natura,' &c. Tertull. ibid. cap. viii. p. 227.

[q] 'Eadem dispositione spiritalis effectus, terrae, id est, carni nostrae, emergenti de lavacro post vetera delicta, columba Sancti Spiritus advolat, pacem Dei adferens, emissa de caelis, ubi Ecclesia est arca figurata.' Tertull. ibid. cap. viii. p. 227.

oratorical flight and figure, contrived for ornament, and to make the more lively impression: it would be wrong to conceive, that every pool, pond, or river, in which any person happened to be baptized, contracted any abiding holiness from that time forwards, or that it was not left open to all common uses as before. It is evident that Tertullian, where he came to explain his notion, and, as it were, to correct his looser and less accurate expressions, did not suppose the waters to be so much as the medium, properly speaking, of sanctification; but he conceived the illapse of the Spirit upon the persons to come afterwards, when the washing was over and done with [r]. I shall only note further, with respect to these passages of Tertullian, that it cannot be certainly concluded from them, that a formal prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit was in use at that time: but from his saying that immediately after invocation of God, such descent followed, and from his adding afterwards, that in or by the benediction the Spirit was called and invited [s], I look upon it as extremely probable [t], that the practice did then obtain, in the African churches, formally to pray for the descent of the Holy Ghost, either before the immersion or after, (upon the imposition of hands,) or perhaps both before and after.

Our next author is Origen, (about A. D. 240,) not that he directly says anything of the descent of the Spirit in Baptism, or of any prayer made use of for that purpose: but he occasionally drops some things which may give light to the present question. His notion was, that the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to sanctify, operates not at all upon inanimate things, nor upon persons of obdurate wickedness, but upon those only who are capable of

[r] 'Restituitur homo Deo, ad similitudinem ejus qui retro ad imaginem Dei fuerat.... Recipit enim illum Dei Spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum. Non quod in aquis Spiritum Sanctum consequamur, sed in aqua emundati sub angelo, Spiritui Sancto praeparamur.' Ibid. cap. v. vi. p. 226.

[s] 'Debinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum Sanctum.' cap. viii. pp. 226, 227.

[t] It might be, that upon a benediction formed in general terms, Christians might expect the illapse of the Spirit: but it appears more natural to think, from what Tertullian here says, that they directly and formally prayed for it.

receiving his sanctifying influences [u]. Now from his saying that the Holy Spirit operates not on things inanimate, it must follow, that he thought not at that time of any descent of the Holy Ghost upon the waters of Baptism, but upon the persons only, those that were worthy. Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, in the decline of the fourth century, charged his doctrine with that consequence, and thereupon condemned it, as overturning the consecration of the waters of Baptism, supposed to be made by the coming of the Holy Ghost upon them [x]. But it is certain that Origen did admit of a consecration of the water [y], though he might not perhaps explain it in the manner which Theophilus most approved of, one hundred and fifty years after: and it is his constant doctrine, that the Baptism of the Spirit goes along with the outward washing, wherever there is no obstacle on the part of the recipient [z]. Nay, he scrupled not to admit, that 'the Spirit of God now moves upon the face of the waters [a]' of Baptism, alluding to Gen. i. 2; so that Origen could not be much out of the way upon this article: but this we may collect from him, that, properly speaking, the work of the Spirit in Baptism was upon the persons, when fitly qualified, rather than upon the outward element; and that the Spirit's coming upon the water, and other the like phrases, ought not to be too rigorously interpreted, but should be understood with due grains of allowance.

A late learned writer, apologizing for Origen, takes notice, that Chrysostom was very positive for the illapse of the Spirit on the outward symbols; a plain sign that he did not think Origen

[u] Vid. Origen. περὶ ἀρχ. p. 62. edit. Bened. Cp. Huetii Origeniana, p. 46. Albertin. lib. ii. p. 357.

[x] 'Dicit (Origenes) Spiritum Sanctum non operari in ea quae inanima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire: quod adserens, non recogitat aquas in Baptismate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari.' Theoph. Alex. Lib. Paschal. i. p. 698; apud Hieronym. Opp. tom. iv. edit. Bened.

[y] Vid. Origen. in Joann. p. 124. edit. Huet. And compare what he says of the eucharistical consecration, (in Matt. p. 254), where the reason is the same. See also Albertinus, p. 358.

[z] Vid. Origen. in Matt. pp. 391, 416; in Joann. pp. 124, 125.

[a] Καὶ παλιγγενεσίας ὀνομαζόμενον λουτρὸν μετὰ ἀνακαινώσεως γινόμενον πνεύματος, τοῦ καὶ νῦν ἐπιφερομένου, ἐπειδὴ περὶ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν, ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' οὐ πᾶσι μετὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐγγινομένου. Ibid. p. 125.

Note, that the Latin version has obscured the sense of the passage, not observing, perhaps, the allusion to Genesis.

to be guilty of the error charged upon him [b]. I rather think, that Chrysostom understood the popular way of expressing the illapse of the Spirit, in the same qualified sense that Origen before did; and that was one reason why he would not come into the warm measures of Theophilus, Epiphanius, and other Eustathians [c] of that time, about the year 400. And whereas it is suggested by the same learned writer [d], that a solemn consecration of things inanimate to holy uses, without supposing a formal illapse of the Spirit upon them, is a degrading account of a venerable mystery, and leaves no difference between the consecration of a church and the consecration of baptismal water, &c.; I must take leave to reply, that the conclusion is not just: for in things so consecrated to holy uses, there will always be as much difference as there is between more and less sacred, according as the ends and uses are higher or lower, holier or less holy. The higher and holier the use is to which anything is consecrated by proper ministers, so much the more worthy it is, and so much the nearer and more important relation it bears to God and religion; demanding thereupon so much the greater reverence and more awful regard.

St. Cyprian (A.D. 255) speaks of a sacerdotal cleansing and sanctification of the baptismal water; which he supposes to be wrought by the Holy Spirit [e], and very frequently makes mention of it, up and down in his works. But he says nothing from whence one may certainly collect whether any formal prayer for the descent was then in use; neither does he explain in what sense the Holy Ghost was understood to sanctify the baptismal waters. Only, as he intimates over and over, that the end and use of sanctifying the water was to convey spiritual graces to the persons coming to be baptized in it; and as it is certain that those spiritual graces could not reside in or upon the outward

[b] Johnson, Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 181, alias 186.

[c] A short account of the odium raised against Origen may be seen in my Second Defence, vol. ii. p. 639, &c., and a larger in Huetius' Origeniana.

[d] Johnson, ibid. p. 182, alias 185.

[e] 'Oportet ergo mundari et sanctificari aquam prius a sacerdote, ut possit Baptismo suo peccata hominis qui baptizatur abluere.... Quomodo autem mundare et sanctificare aquam potest, qui ipse immundus est, et apud quem Spiritus Sanctus non est?' Cyprian. Epist. lxx. p. 190.

element; it is more than probable that he supposed the Spirit to rest where those spiritual effects rested, that is, upon the persons only: and then the sanctifying of the waters can mean no more than the consecrating them to the uses of personal sanctification. The Spirit made use of them as a symbol, for conveying his graces; and in that use consisted their relative holiness: but the Spirit dwells not properly upon them, but upon the persons baptized.

When we come down to the fourth century, there we find plainer evidences of formal prayers offered for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the waters of Baptism. Cyril of Jerusalem (who wrote A.D. 348) speaks to his catechumens thus[f]: 'The Holy Ghost is coming to seal your souls: . . . . look not upon the laver as common water, but to the spiritual grace bestowed along with it. . . . This common water, upon receiving the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and of Christ, and of the Father, acquires a virtue of sanctification.' It may be doubted whether Cyril here refers to the prayer of Consecration or to the form of Baptism: but it appears most probable that he refers to the Consecration; as the Benedictine editor has endeavoured to prove at large, in his notes upon the place. What I have further to observe upon it is, that Cyril speaks of the water as receiving a sanctifying virtue. And what does he mean by it? He means what he had just before said, that the outward washing and the inward graces go together, and are both conferred at once upon the worthy receiver in the self-same act. The visible sign is connected, in certain effect, with the invisible grace; and both are applied, at the same instant, to the same man, jointly concurring to the same end and use[g]. This is the foundation of the common way of speaking, as if the Spirit and the water were physically united with each other; which is not strictly true in notion, but amounts to the same in moral effect.

[f] Μέλλει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σφραγίζειν ὑμῶν τὰς ψυχάς . . . μὴ ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λουτρῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος διδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι . . . τὸ λιτὸν ὕδωρ πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πατρὸς τὴν ἐπίκλησιν λαβὸν δύναμιν, ἁγιότητος ἐπικτᾶται. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. iii. sect. 3. pp. 40, 41.

[g] Vid. Vossius Harmon. Evangel. lib. iii. cap. 4. p. 233. Opp. tom. vi.

Optatus, an African Bishop, (A.D. 368,) alluding to the name ἰχθὺς, (a technical name of our Lord,) says; 'This fish (meaning Christ) is brought down upon the waters of the font, in Baptism, by invocation[h].' I presume this refers to the Consecration prayer[i]: and so it imports an expectance of, or petition for, the divine presence of Christ, to sanctify the person baptized in the use of the appointed service.

St. Basil, of the same age, (A.D. 374,) speaks of the conjunction of water and the Spirit in Baptism; first observing, (in order to obviate mistakes or invidious constructions,) that the Church did not mean to prefer water before all other creatures; much less to give it a share in the honours due to the Father and the Son[k]: but he takes notice, that the water serves to make out the symbol of a death unto sin, and the Spirit is the pledge or earnest of life[l]: therefore water and the Spirit go together in that Sacrament. Then he adds, that as to the grace supposed to be in the water, it belongs not properly to the water, but is entirely owing to the presence of the Spirit[m]. Presence how, and where? To the water, or to the persons? His next immediate words will decide the question; for he adds, in the language of St. Peter, that 'Baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the stipulation of a good conscience towards God[n].' The Spirit therefore, in his account, must rest upon the persons, to answer the end. He proceeds, soon after, to observe how much the Baptism of the Spirit is preferable to baptizing merely with water; and he takes notice, that there is a Baptism, as valuable as any, wherein no water at all is needful, namely, Baptism in one's own blood, as a martyr for the name of Christ. Then he closes up the article he was upon in these

[h] 'Hic est piscis qui in Baptismate, per invocationem, fontalibus undis inseritur,' &c. Optat. lib. iii. p. 61.

[i] See Bingham, Christian Antiq. b. xi. c. 10. sect. i. vol. iv. p. 167, &c. Oxf. edit.

[k] *Καὶ εἰς ὕδωρ βαπτιζόμεθα, καὶ οὐδήπου τὸ ὕδωρ πάσης ὁμοῦ τῆς κτίσεως προτιμήσομεν, ἢ καὶ αὐτῷ τῆς πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τιμῆς μεταδώσομεν.* Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xv. p. 28. tom. iii. edit. Bened.

[l] Basil. ibid. p. 29.

[m] *Ὥστε εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι χάρις, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς φύσεώς ἐστι τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος παρουσίας. οὐ γάρ ἐστι τὸ βάπτισμα ῥύπου σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεόν.* Basil. Ibid. p. 29.

[n] 1 Pet. iii. 21.

words: 'Not that I say this in order to disparage water-baptism, but to baffle the reasonings of those who rise up against the Spirit, and who would blend things together which are not blended, and compare things together which admit not of comparison [o].'

I have laid these things together, as explanatory of what the ancient Fathers meant by joining the Spirit with the outward elements in the Sacraments, (for the reason is the same in both,) and as serving to clear up some of their other more dubious or less guarded expressions. Here, when an objection was raised by adversaries [p], grounded on nothing but words and names, this good Father then rejected with abhorrence any such mixture of the Spirit and the water as the Catholics were maliciously charged with: and he declared they were *ἄμικτα*, not mixed with each other. At the same time, he insinuated the true meaning of all to be, that the Spirit and the water so far went together[q], as to be applied at once to the same man, in the same service; but that the Spirit properly rested upon the person baptized, and not upon the outward element. Had the Romanists been as careful to distinguish in the matter of the Eucharist, as Basil here was with respect to Baptism, they would have seen no more reason for adoration of the Host, than Basil could find for adoration of water. He rejected the latter with the utmost disdain; and so should they likewise have rejected the former. But I proceed.

In the same treatise, the same excellent writer speaks of the

[o] Καὶ οὐκ ἀθετῶν τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βάπτισμα ταῦτα λέγω· ἀλλὰ τοὺς λογισμοὺς καθαιρῶν τῶν ἐπαιρομένων κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ μιγνύντων τὰ ἄμικτα, καὶ παρεικαζόντων τὰ ἀσυνείκαστα. Basil. p. 30.

[p] As the Catholics had argued justly for the divinity of the Holy Ghost, from our being baptized into the Spirit, and sanctified by the Spirit, the Macedonians, on the other hand, frowardly retorted, that we are baptized also *εἰς ὕδωρ*, in, or into water, and sanctified by water; and therefore water would be divine, by that argument, as much as the Spirit. It was in reply to such impertinent cavils, that Basil took occasion to explain what concerned the water and what the Spirit in that Sacrament.

[q] This is clearly expressed by Nazianzen of the same time:

Διττὴ καὶ ἡ κάθαρσις, δι' ὕδατός τε φημὶ, καὶ πνεύματος, τοῦ μὲν θεωρητῶς τε καὶ σωματικῶς λαμβανομένου, τοῦ δὲ ἀσωμάτως καὶ ἀθεωρήτως συντρέχοντος. Nazianz. Orat. xl. in Baptism. p. 641. Cp. Greg. Nyss. tom. ii. p. 801. de Bapt. Christi.

consecration, or benediction, that passes upon the waters of Baptism, analogous to that of the Eucharist, which he had spoken of a little before. 'We also bless,' says he, 'the water of Baptism, and the oil of Chrism, and the person likewise whom we baptize[r].' But yet he understood the difference (as may appear from what hath been before said) between the relative holiness thereupon accruing to the water, or the oil, and the grace of the Spirit accruing to the person baptized. Having dwelt thus largely upon Basil, who may serve as a key to all the rest, I shall but touch upon others who came after, contenting myself with a bare recital of their testimonies, as needing no further comment.

Gregory Nyssen, of the same time, (Basil's younger brother,) speaking of Baptism, says; 'It is not the water that confers this benefit, (for then would it be superior to the whole creation,) but it is the appointment of God, and the supervening of the Spirit, mystically advancing to our rescue: however, the water serves to signify the cleansing[s].' A little after he observes, that the Spirit invisible, being called by faith, comes in a manner ineffable, and blesses both the person and the water: and the water so blessed purifies and illuminates the man[t]: but if the man is not bettered, the water is mere water to him, destitute of the Spirit[u].

St. Ambrose (or whoever is the author) speaks of the descent

[r] Εὐλογοῦμεν καὶ τό τε ὕδωρ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον τῆς χρίσεως, καὶ προσέτι αὐτὸν τὸν βαπτιζόμενον. Basil. de Sp. Sanct. cap. 27. p. 55.

'Cum veteres aiunt sanguinem Christi et Spiritum Sanctum se aquae miscere, populare est loquendi genus; quod ita capere oportet quasi dicerent, quando aqua abluimur foris, oculis fidei intuendum esse sanguinem et spiritum Christi, quia haec cum aqua concurrunt, haud secus, ac si miscerentur cum aqua.' Voss. de Bapt. Disp. v. p. 274. Cp. de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia, pp. 252, 253. tom. vi.

[s] Ταύτην δὲ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν οὐ τὸ ὕδωρ χαρίζεται. ἦν γὰρ ἂν πάσης τῆς κτίσεως ὑψηλότερον· ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ πρόσταγμα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις, μυστικῶς ἐρχομένη πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐλευθερίαν. ὕδωρ δὲ ὑπηρετεῖ πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς καθάρσεως. Greg. Nyss. in Baptism. Christi, p. 801.

[t] Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀφανὲς, πίστει καλούμενον, ἀρρήτως παραγινόμενον ... εὐλογεῖ τὸ βαπτιζόμενον, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ βαπτίζον. p. 801. ὕδωρ εὐλογούμενον καθαίρει καὶ φωτίζει τὸν ἄνθρωπον. p. 803.

[u] Ἐπὶ τούτων τὸ ὕδωρ ὕδωρ ἐστὶν, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφανείσης, &c. p. 540.

of the Holy Ghost in Baptism[x]: and also of the presence of Christ upon the sacerdotal invocation[y]. But it is remarkable, how in one place he distinguishes the descent of the Spirit upon the water from the descent upon the persons, and, as it were, corrects an inaccurate expression by one more proper[z], intimating what the vulgar way of speaking really and strictly meant. In another treatise, he mentions the descent of the Holy Ghost in Baptism, after the sacerdotal invocation[a]: from whence it is manifest that some prayer was then used to be offered up for that purpose, imploring such descent. The book De Sacramentis is not justly ascribed to St. Ambrose: some think it may have been compiled not long after him, by some of his chief admirers[b], others set it later. I shall only take notice of a custom then prevailing, of praying for the presence of the Son and Holy Ghost, in their Baptismal Offices; or sometimes of the whole Trinity[c].

I shall descend no lower in this account, (since enough has been said,) except it be to present the reader with two or three forms of the invocation made in Baptism, beseeching God to send the Holy Spirit to sanctify the baptismal waters, or the persons to be baptized. We have not many of those forms remaining, in comparison of what we have with respect to the other

[x] 'Illis angelus descendebat: tibi Spiritus Sanctus: illis creatura movebatur, tibi Christus operatur, ipse Dominus creaturae.' Ambros. de Myster. cap. iv. p. 330. edit. Bened. 'In hunc fontem vis divina descendit.' p. 331; cp. 342.

[y] 'Crede ergo adesse Dominum Jesum, invocatum precibus sacerdotum.' p. 332.

[z] 'Non utique dubitandum est, quod (Spiritus) superveniens in fontem, vel super eos qui Baptismum consequuntur, veritatem regenerationis operetur.' Ambros. ibid. cap. ix. p. 342.

[a] 'Quid in hoc typo angelus, nisi descensionem Sancti Spiritus nunciabat, quae nostris futura temporibus, aquas sacerdotalibus invocata precibus consecraret?' Ambros. de Sp. Sanct. lib. i. cap. 7. p. 618.

[b] See the Editor's preface to that work. Oudin brings it down to the eighth century, about 780. See Oudin, tom. i. p. 1858. Some attribute it to Maximus Taurinensis of the fifth. Vid. Fabricius, Bibl. Med. et Infim. Latin. lib. xii. p. 191.

[c] 'Ubi primum ingreditur sacerdos, exorcismum facit secundum creaturam aquae; invocatione postea et precem defert, ut sanctificetur fons, et adsit praesentia Trinitatis aeternae.' Pseud-Ambros. de Sacram. lib. i. cap. v. p. 353.

'Venit sacerdos, precem dicit ad fontem, invocat Patris nomen, praesentiam Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.' Lib. ii. cap. 5. pp. 357, 358.

The reader may see more authorities of like kind in Albertin. p. 465.

Sacrament, less care having been taken to preserve or to collect them: but we have enough for our purpose. One of them occurs in the Constitutions; the oldest perhaps that is extant, though of uncertain date. It runs thus: 'Look down from heaven, and sanctify this water: give it grace and power, that he who is baptized therein, according to the command of thy Christ, may be crucified with him, and die with him, and be buried with him, and rise again with him to that adoption which comes by him; that dying unto sin, he may live unto righteousness [d].' Here indeed no express mention is made of the Holy Ghost the Sanctifier: but it is implied in the word 'sanctify,' and 'grace,' and 'power,' or 'virtue.' The blessing, we may note, is craved upon the water: but as no grace can properly rest there as in its subject, it is plain what all means, viz. that the persons should receive the grace of the Holy Ghost in the use of that water according to divine appointment; or that the outward washing and the inward graces go together [e]. So, in common or customary speech, when any one prays that God may bless the means made use of for any person's recovery, nobody understands more in it than that God may bless the persons in the use of those means, and crown them with the success desired. We have another the like form in Pope Gregory's Sacramentarium: which however in its present state is not altogether so old as that Pope; for the Sacramentary is not without interpolations [f]. The

[d] Κάτιδε ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο· δὸς δὲ χάριν καὶ δύναμιν, ὥστε τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, αὐτῷ συσταυρωθῆναι, &c. Constitut. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 43. p. 384.

N. B. As to the age of the Constitutions, Mr. Dodwell observes, that there is no evidence for them, (as we now have them in eight books,) elder than the time of Dionysius Exiguus, who was of the sixth century. See Dodwell of Incensing, p. 164. Ittigius and Buddaeus give the like judgment. Others name the fifth century.

'Praeferenda mihi reliquis videtur sententia Thomae Ittigii, quarto omnino saeculo Constitutiones quasdam Apostolicas innotuisse, quae postea circa sextum saeculum ab homine quodam Ariano corruptae fuerint et interpolatae.' Budd. Isagog. p. 747. Cp. Turner, ch. xxiii. p. 237, &c. Fabric. Bibl. Graec. tom. v. p. 33. tom. xi. pp. 7–10.

[e] Accordingly, the person baptized is directed, immediately after to pray for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him. Δός μοι ... πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐπιφοίτησιν πρὸς κτῆσιν καὶ πληροφορίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. Ibid. cap. xlv. p. 385.

[f] Of the age of the Gregorian Sacramentary, see Dodwell of Incense, p. 218, &c.

form runs thus: 'Let the virtue of thy Spirit descend, O Lord, upon the plenitude of this font, and impregnate all the substance of this water with a regenerating efficacy: here may the spots of all sins be washed off; here may that nature, formed after thy image, and now restored to its original purity, be cleansed from all its former stains; that every one coming to this Sacrament of regeneration may be born again to a new infancy of true innocence[g].' Here we may observe, that the petition is put up for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the waters, as usual, for the benefit of the persons, that they may therein receive remission of sins, and all other spiritual graces, for restoring original righteousness lost by the fall of Adam, and for supporting and sustaining the Christian life.

The Gothic Missal published by Mabillon[h], bearing date as high as the eighth century[i], will furnish us with another form; wherein the descent of the Holy Spirit is directly prayed for, to sanctify the baptismal waters, in order to derive pardon and grace upon the persons brought to the font[k]. I shall take notice of but one more, which occurs in the Gallican Sacramentary, of the latter end of the eighth century, or thereabout[l]. There also prayer is directly and in terms made, that God would send his Holy Spirit upon the water, in order to the purifying and regenerating the persons coming to Baptism[m].

[g] 'Descendat, Domine, in hanc plenitudinem fontis virtus Spiritus tui; totamque hujus aquae substantiam regenerandi foecundet effectu. Hic omnium peccatorum maculae deleantur, hic natura ad imaginem Dei condita, et ad honorem sui reformata principis, vetustatis cunctis squaloribus emundetur, omnis homo hoc Sacramentum regenerationis ingressus, in verae innocentiae novam infantiam renascatur.' Gregor. Mag. Lib. Sacram. p. 73. ed. Bened.

[h] Mabillon de Liturgia Gallicana, p. 188, &c.

[i] See Mabillon, Praef. sect. ix. And compare Dodwell of Incense, p. 190.

[k] 'Benedic, Domine Deus noster, hanc creaturam aquae, et descendat super eam virtus tua: desuper infunde Spiritum tuum, sanctum Paraclitum, angelum veritatis. Sanctifica, Domine, hujus laticis undas, sicut sanctificasti fluenta Jordanis, ut qui in hunc fontem descenderint, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et peccatorum veniam, et Sancti Spiritus infusionem consequi mereantur.' Missal. Goth. p. 248.

[l] See Mabillon, Musc. Italic. tom. i. in Praefat. ad Sacram. G. p. 275. Dodwell of Incense, p. 203, &c.

[m] 'Te Deum Patrem omnipotentem deprecamur, ut hic Spiritum Sanctum in aquam hanc supermittere digneris, ut quoscunque baptizaverimus in nomine, &c., purificans et regenerans accipias eos in numero sanctorum tuorum, et consummes in

I hope my readers will not think much of the excursion which I have here made into the Sacrament of Baptism, with a view to illustrate what belongs to our present subject of the Eucharist. For indeed I know of no surer or shorter way of coming at a just and clear apprehension of what concerns one, than by comparing together and duly weighing the circumstances of both. They are both of them equally Sacraments of the Christian Church, and have the like promise of the Holy Spirit, founded in the same merits of Christ's obedience and sufferings: there is the same reason for a consecration of the outward symbols in both, the same ground for expecting the presence of the Spirit; the same warrant for asking it; the same rule to go by in the doing it; and the like primitive practice to countenance it. If we proceed upon favourable presumption, that what obtained universally, without order of councils, in the third or fourth century, (and of which there is no memorandum left when it began,) must be taken for apostolical, then the practice as to either Sacrament will bear the same date: but if we choose rather, apart from all conjectures, to set the practice in each no higher than we have certain evidences of it, from monuments now extant, then we must date the practice with respect to Baptism no higher than the third, or however second century, when Tertullian flourished; and with respect to the Eucharist, no higher perhaps than the fourth, as we shall see presently [n].

I am aware, that several very worthy and learned men (and among the rest Dr. Grabe) have thought of an earlier date than I have just now mentioned; and by their united labours and searches into that question, have enabled those that come after them to see the more clearly into it. Two very learned writers, (not to mention more now,) Mr. Pfaffius abroad, and Mr. Johnson at home, have particularly traced that matter with all the diligence imaginable, and have both of them endeavoured to carry it up as high as there was any colour for carrying it. One of

Spiritu tuo sancto in vitam aeternam, in saecula saeculorum.' Sacrament. Gallican. p. 124.

[n] The testimonies of such invocation in the Eucharist are collected by Pfaffius, p. 374, &c. Bingham, xv. 3, 11. Collier, Reasons, &c. p. 21, &c. Deylingius, Observ. Miscell. p. 196, &c. 344, &c.

them appeals even to Ignatius, as a voucher for the practice[o], because he makes mention of some heretics who 'abstained from the Eucharist and prayer, as not acknowledging the Eucharist to be the flesh of Christ Jesus[p].' But I cannot see how, by any ever so distant consequence, we can thence fairly conclude, that it was the practice of that time to pray for the descent of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist: for if the words of the institution were but used in the prayer of Consecration in those days, that alone is sufficient to account for all that Ignatius says there, or anywhere else.

Mr. Pfaffius, more plausibly, endeavours to run up the practice as high as Irenaeus of the second century. And, indeed, could he have sufficiently warranted the genuineness of those fragments which he has obliged the learned world with, under the name of Irenaeus, there could have been no room left for further dispute on that head[q]. But he has not done it; neither is it, I believe, possible to be done[r]. As to his argument drawn from the use of the word ἔκκλησις, or ἐπίκλησις, invocation of God, in Irenaeus's certainly genuine works[s], it is too precarious a topic to build a thing of this moment upon; because there may be an invocation of God in prayer, without any praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit; and ἐπίκλησις is nothing but a common name for any kind of invocation in prayer; as when the three Persons are named or invoked in the form of Baptism, (for so Origen uses it[t],) or are otherwise named in the Eucharist; as they certainly were by Justin Martyr's account[u]. No proof therefore hath been yet given of the practice of praying for the descent of the Holy Ghost, in the eucharistical service, so early as Irenaeus's days.

Mr. Pfaffius endeavours next[w] to make it at least as ancient as the third century; because the Dialogue against the Marcionites,

[o] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 241, alias 245; part ii. p. 180. Compare Collier, Reasons, &c. p. 22. Defence, p. 101, &c. Vindication, p. 109, &c. 128, &c.

[p] Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. cap. vii. p. 4.

[q] Vid. Fragmenta Irenaei ap. Pfaff. p. 27; cp. p. 94, &c.

[r] Vid. Scipio Maffeius in Notis ad Cassiodori Complex. pp. 240, 241.

[s] Iren. pp. 60, 251. edit. Bened. Cp. Pfaffius, p. 96, &c.

[t] Origen. in Joann. p. 124, et apud Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. 29.

[u] Justin. Martyr. Apol. i. p. 96. Cp. Cyrill. Hieros. Mystag. i. sect. vii. p. 308.

[w] Pfaffius in Praefat.

commonly ascribed to Origen, or else to Maximus of the same age, makes mention of the Holy Spirit's coming upon the Eucharist[x]. But besides that there is no mention of any prayer for such descent, (so that the evidence here comes not up to the point in question,) I say, besides that, the author of that Dialogue, most certainly, was neither Origen, nor Maximus, nor any of that age, but probably another Adamantius, who lived in the fourth century, in the time of Constantine; as the learned editor in his new edition of Origen has observed at large[y]. At last then, we must be content to come down as low as the fourth century, and indeed towards the middle of it, (when the elder Cyril wrote,) for clear and undoubted evidence of the practice of praying for the illapse of the Spirit upon the symbols in the holy Communion. No doubt but it was used in the Church of Jerusalem before, for Cyril did not invent it, nor first use it: but how long before, is the question; which, for want of higher records, we cannot now certainly determine. Cyril intimates part of the very form of the invocation then in use; and it may be worth the setting down here for the reader's perusal. 'We beseech the all-merciful God to send the Holy Ghost upon the elements, that he may make the bread Christ's body, and the wine Christ's blood. For whatsoever the Holy Ghost once touches, that most certainly must be sanctified and changed[z].' That is, as to its uses or offices. Some time after, the Priest says; 'Holy are the elements which lie before us, having received the illapse of the Holy Spirit: holy also are ye, being now endowed with the Holy Spirit[a].' This was said before the receiving; which I note, for the sake of some inferences to be made from it: 1. That the elements are not here made the conduit of the Holy Spirit, (for the Spirit is supposed to be

[x] Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔρχεται. Adamantius Dialog. sect. ii. p. 826. edit. Bened.

[y] Delarue in Admonitione praevia, p. 800, &c.

[z] Παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα· ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ· πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἐὰν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται. Cyrill. Mystag. v. cap. 7. p. 327. Cp. Albertin. 320.

[a] "Αγια τὰ προκείμενα, ἐπιφοίτησιν δεξάμενα ἁγίου πνεύματος· ἅγιοι καὶ ὑμεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου καταξιωθέντες. Τὰ ἅγια οὖν τοῖς ἁγίοις κατάλληλα. Ibid. c. xix. p. 331.

received by the communicants before them and without them,) but the service of the Eucharist is the conduit rather, if either of them properly be so. 2. That the meaning of the prayer for the illapse of the Spirit is, to invite the Spirit to come down upon the communicants immediately, or principally, to make them holy in a sense proper to them, as well as to make the elements holy in a sense proper to things inanimate: therefore Cyril adds, 'holy things then are meet for holy men.' Hence also came that ancient eucharistical form of 'sancta sanctis,' holy things for holy men [b], made use of previously to the reception of the sacred symbols. 3. Though the elements are sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and thereupon become relatively holy, as being now sacred symbols and representatives of our Lord's body and blood, yet they are not beneficial to unholy persons, but hurtful, and therefore are not to them the body and blood of Christ in real grace, virtue, energy, or effect. 4. Since the persons are supposed to become holy by the presence of the Holy Spirit, previously to receiving, in order to reap benefit from it, it is plain that, as to the request for making the elements Christ's body and blood, the meaning only is, that they may be so made, not in themselves, but to the communicants [c], considered as holy: for,

[b] A full account of it may be seen in Menardus's Notes upon the Gregorian Sacramentary, p. 566. Touttée's Notes on Cyril, p. 331. And Bingham's Eccles. Antiq. book xv. ch. 3. sect. 31. vol. v. p. 344. Oxf. edit.

[c] So in the Canon of the Mass, and in our Communion Service of King Edward's Prayer-Book of the first edition, the words run, 'That they may become to us the body and blood of Christ.' Of which Mr. Thorndike very judiciously comments, as here follows:

'These words "to us," make an abatement in the proper signification of the body and blood. For the elements may be said to become the body and blood of Christ without addition, in the same true sense in which they are so called in the Scriptures: but when they are said to become the body and blood of Christ to them that communicate, that true sense is so well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise than to import, not the corporal substance, but the spiritual use of them.' Thorndike, Relig. Assemb. p. 369.

'In the book of the holy Communion we do not pray absolutely, that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us, in that holy mystery, they may be so: that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same, that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood, and that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished.' Archbishop Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 79. edit. 1580.

were the elements absolutely Christ's body and blood, they would be so both to the holy and unholy, which they are not. Indeed both good and bad do receive the consecrated signs, but those only who are worthy do receive the things signified.

The next oldest form we meet with, after Cyril's, may be that of the Constitutions, falsely called Apostolical: 'We beseech thee, O God, thou that art above the need of anything, to look graciously down upon these gifts here lying before thee, and to accept them favourably for the honour of thy Christ, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus; that he may make this bread become the body of thy Christ, and this cup become the blood of thy Christ; that they may partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his impostures, may be filled with the Holy Ghost,' &c.[d] I need not go on to later forms of like kind, many of which are to be met with in the large Collections of Liturgies, published by Fabricius, Goar, Renaudot, Mabillon, and others. The English reader may find a competent number of the same in a Collection translated by several hands, and published by the Reverend Dr. Brett, with several very learned and curious Dissertations upon them, worth the considering[e]. All I need do here is to make some general remarks, proper to give light to the true and full meaning of those liturgic forms, with respect to the descent or illapse of the Spirit, either upon the communicants or upon the symbols.

1. It is observable, that the naked symbols, before the Spirit is supposed to approach, or to make them Christ's body and blood, are offered up as gifts, and called a sacrifice. I inquire not now in what sense, designing a distinct chapter for that

[d] Ἀξιοῦμέν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, σὺ ὁ ἀνενδεὴς Θεὸς, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ καταπέμψῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, τοῦ Διαβόλου καὶ τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ ῥυσθῶσιν, πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν. κ. τ. λ. Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12. p. 407.

[e] Brett's Collection of the principal Liturgies, printed A.D. 1720.

purpose below: but such is the common form and tenor of most of the other Liturgies, Greek ones especially; St. James's [f], St. Mark's [g], Basil's [h], and St. Gregory's [i], as they are called.

2. Next it is observable, from the old Liturgies, that after the oblation and sacrifice, and after the illapse of the Spirit upon the symbols, to make them authentic and effective representatives of our Lord's body and blood, another very solemn prayer was wont to be put up, pleading to God the merits of Christ's passion, and beseeching him, for the sake thereof, to be propitious towards the communicants in particular, and towards the Church in general. Cyril represents that part of the service thus: 'After the finishing the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service; over that sacrifice of propitiation, we beseech God in behalf of the common peace of the churches . . . we offer Christ slain for our sins, entreating the all-merciful God to be propitious to ourselves and others [k].' There is such another form of prayer in the Constitutions [l]: it follows the oblation, and may itself be called, and often has been called, another oblation. But the proper name for it is Commemoration of the passion, now made before God, pleading the merit of the same, in order to obtain the fruits and benefits of it. This part of the service was very ancient, and most undoubtedly did obtain, in some shape or other, even from the beginning; pursuant to our Lord's command, to make commemoration of him, and to St. Paul's account of the Eucharist, as shewing the Lord's death till his coming again. Such memorial of the passion is more than once mentioned by Justin Martyr, and Origen, and Cyprian, and Eusebius, and Chrysostom, and many more [m]. The meaning of the petition which went

[f] Jacobi Liturg. apud Fabric. pp. 66, 68, 70, 82, 96.

[g] Marci Liturg. apud Fabric. pp. 275, 278, 286, 287.

[h] Basil. Liturg. in Renaudot. pp. 57, 61, 68.

[i] Gregorii Liturg. apud Renaudot. pp. 90, 94, 95, 105.

[k] Εἶτα, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης . . . Χριστὸν ἐσφαγισμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν, ἐξιλεούμενοι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν. Cyrill. Mystag. v. pp. 327, 328.

[l] Constitut. Apostol. lib. viii. cap. 13. pp. 408, 409.

[m] See above, ch. i. pp. 21, 32, under the name Oblation and Memorial.

along with it was, that our blessed Saviour, who is our intercessor and advocate above, might vouchsafe to make those prayers acceptable at the throne of grace, pleading the interest of his all-prevailing sacrifice in heaven[n]. The Liturgy in Ambrose has the like memorial with the former, after the consecration[o]: and so has the Gallican Sacramentary[p]. The Greek and Oriental Liturgies have commonly the same, but not always in the same order; sometimes placing the memorial, or annunciation, improperly, before the consecration[q], and again, more properly, after[r]: which is an argument of the lateness of those Liturgies, as we now have them, and of the confused state wherein most of them are.

3. But the most material point of all is to fix the true meaning of the invocation and illapse of the Spirit, into which the Greeks commonly resolve the consecration. The Romish Divines have frequently laid hold of what is said concerning the illapse of the Spirit, as favourable to their tenet of transubstantiation; because the Holy Ghost is said to make the bread the body, and the wine the blood of Christ. But when it came to be observed, that the Greeks constantly used that prayer of invocation, for the descent of the Spirit, after the words of the institution, (in which the Romanists fix the consecration,) a great difficulty arose, how to reconcile Greeks and Latins, upon the article of consecration: for the former placed it in the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the latter in the words of institution. A solution at length was thought on, namely, that the descent or illapse of the Holy Ghost, spoken of in the Greek Liturgies, should not be understood to make the symbols Christ's body, &c. (being made such before in consecration, by the words, 'This is my body,' &c.), but to make the reception of the body and blood beneficial and salutary to the communicants. Many of the learned Latins, at the Council of Florence, and after, embraced

[n] 'Offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit.' Ambrosius de Offic. lib. i. cap. 48.

[o] Pseudo-Ambrosius de Sacrament. lib. iv. cap. 6.

[p] Sacramentar. Gallican. p. 280.

[q] Jacob. Liturg. ap. Fabric. p. 82. Basil. Liturg. pp. 61, 68.

[r] Jacob. Liturg. p. 96.

the solution with some eagerness. Bessarion also then, and Arcudius afterwards, (two Latinized Greeks,) set themselves to defend it, and did it with good learning and judgment [s]. It appears to be true, that they justly interpreted the intent and meaning of that invocation, by the beneficial effect of the illapse of the Spirit upon the communicants in the use of the symbols, and not by the Spirit's making the symbols absolutely the body and blood: and we are so far obliged to them, for pleading unawares on the Protestant side, and thereby giving up the most plausible colours which all antiquity could afford for the novel doctrine of transubstantiation [t].

It must however be owned, that the later and shrewder Romanists, observing how their friends were caught in their own snare, have been very solicitous to retract that occasional concession, and to condemn Bessarion, Arcudius, and others, for giving into it. Lequien is one of those who endeavour to recall the grant [u]; and Renaudot is another [x]; and Touttée a third [y]. They are justly sensible, how their most specious pretences from the ancients are at once taken from them, and that the Protestant cause is now triumphant, in that article, even upon their own concessions. Their perceiving it with such concern does not at all abate the force of what Bessarion, and Arcudius, and many more of their friends very learnedly and justly pleaded for the original meaning of that form. All circumstances shew, that the true and ancient intent of that part of the service was not to implore any physical change in the elements, no, nor so much as a physical connection of the Spirit with the elements, but a moral

[s] See particularly Arcudius de Concord. Eccles. Occident. et Orient. l. iii. cap. 33. p. 287, &c.

[t] See Dr. Covel's Account of the Gr. Church, p. 54, &c.

[u] Lequien in Notis ad Damascen. tom. i. p. 269.

[x] 'Quod aiunt Bessarionis et Arcudii imitatores totam orationem referri ad fructuosam mysterii susceptionem, ferri non potest. . . . Unde sequeretur nullam esse transmutationem erga indigne communicantes, quae germanissima est Protestantium doctrina. . . . Si haec ad solam fructuosam communionem referantur, nulla magis commoda Protestantium causae interpretatio excogitari poterat.' Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. tom. ii. p. 93.

[y] 'Verba haec detorquere ad effectus Eucharistiae in nobis postulandos, ecclesiam luculentissimo, antiquissimo, et constantissimo transubstantiationis testimonio privare est.' Touttée Cyrillian. Dissertat. iii. p. 238.

change only in the elements, as to relations and uses, and a gracious presence of the Holy Spirit upon the communicants [z].

One argument of it may be drawn from the style of the prayer, 'super nos, et super haec dona [a],' begging the descent upon the communicants first, and then upon the elements; that is to say, upon the communicants in the use of those now holy or consecrated symbols. Renaudot would persuade us, that the 'super nos' relates to the consecrators, or to the officiating clergy [b]. But what I have before cited from St. Cyril, as understanding the descent of the Spirit to be upon the communicants in general, is a sufficient confutation of every such surmise.

Another argument of what I am here pleading for may be drawn from the restriction to us, inserted in that form, in several Liturgies; particularly in the Gregorian Sacramentary [c], and from thence derived to the Canon of the Mass. I have shewn the meaning of it before, and need not here repeat.

But the clearest and strongest argument of all may be drawn from the like form of invocation in the Baptismal Offices; where it is certain that it could mean only a moral change of the water as to use and office, not a physical change of its substance. Why should the illapse of the Holy Spirit be supposed to work any greater, or any other change in the elements of the Eucharist, than in the waters of Baptism [d]?

Renaudot, being aware of this difficulty, offers a kind of salvo for it; namely, that though the Spirit is invited to come down upon the waters in Baptism, yet he comes not to change the waters into Christ's body and blood, but to give regeneration and remission to the persons. He observes likewise, that when the Spirit is invoked upon the oil, or chrism, or persons to be

[z] Vid. Fulgent. ad Monim. lib. ii. cap. 9, 10.

[a] See the Liturgies in Fabricius, 68, 84, 85, 98, 204, 205, 243, 298, 300; or in Renaudotius, tom. i. pp. 16, 31, 46, 48, 68, 105; tom. ii. pp. 118, 143, 313, 325.

[b] Renaudot. Liturg. Orient. tom. i. p. 340.

[c] 'Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus quaesumus benedictam ... facere digneris, ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat,' &c.

[d] Compare what Mr. Pfaffius has well urged on this head, p. 76, &c. Though it must be said, that his own hypothesis will no more clear this article, than the Popish one can; for the invocation in Baptism draws down nothing but what is spiritual.

ordained, or whatever else is to be consecrated, it amounts only to a petition for the grace of the Spirit upon the parties concerned; which is quite another thing from changing the symbols in the Eucharist into the body and blood[e]. But this appears to be begging the question, or rather to be giving up the main thing: for what we assert is, that the ancients supposed the like illapse of the Spirit, and like change wrought in the waters of Baptism, and in the oil, and chrism, &c., as in the elements of the Eucharist; and therefore if in those it amounted only to a moral or spiritual change, it cannot, upon their principles, amount to more in this. Cyril of Jerusalem, as before quoted, plainly makes those several cases so far parallel[f]; and so does Gregory Nyssen[g] after him: therefore Mr. Renaudot's concessions turn upon himself, and recoil upon his own hypothesis. It is not indeed said, that the Holy Ghost in Baptism converts the water into body and blood; neither is it said, that the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist converts the symbols into water of life, or into a celestial garment; each Sacrament has its distinguishing style and title, proper to the symbols of it, and to the resemblance intended in it. For though they exhibit the same graces, yet they do it not under the same types, figures, or symbols: and that

[e] 'Invocatur quoque ut mittat Spiritum Sanctum super aquas baptismales, ut in illis baptizati accipiant regenerationem, omniumque peccatorum remissionem: super oleum, et chrisma, ut gratiam baptizatis novam conferant: super ordinandos, ut accipiant sanctimoniam et potestatem ad sacra ministeria sancte exercenda: super oleum infirmorum, ut ejus unctio prosit infirmis ad salutem animae et corporis. . . . Verum in Eucharistia consecranda, aliud quiddam se petere designant, nempe illapsum efficacem Spiritus Sancti in dona proposita, ut mutentur et transferantur in corpus et sanguinem Domini: quod de aqua, chrismate, oleoque, aliisque Sacramentis, nunquam postulasse orientales reperiuntur.' Renaudot. tom. i. pp. 196, 197.

[f] See above, ch. vii. p. 159. Compare Bingham, book xi. ch. x. sect. 4.

[g] Gregor. Nyssen. de Baptismo Christi, tom. ii. pp. 801, 802. edit. Paris. 1615. Dr. Covel has observed the same at large, with respect to the later rituals, in his Account of the Greek Church, p. 33, &c. And though he intended the instances there given only to shew, that such forms implied no physical change in the things so consecrated, yet they really prove more, viz. that the Holy Spirit was supposed to rest upon the persons in the use of the symbols, and not upon the symbols themselves, in strictness of speech. I may note also, that in pp. 56, 57, he has fully confuted the most specious pretence which the Romanists commonly make from some corrupt copies of Basil's Liturgy, by producing a truer reading out of a different copy, near six hundred years old.

is the sole reason of the different style here and there. There is the same change wrought in both, and by the same Divine power, and to the same salutary purposes. There is the same kind of prayer in both, for the same kind of illapse or presence of the Spirit, and for the same kind of grace, virtue, and efficacy, whether upon the symbols or recipients. If we feed upon Christ in the Eucharist, we put him on in Baptism, which comes to the same thing in the main. If we are partakers of the spiritual lamb there, so are we also here. If we drink his blood there, we are dipped in his blood here, which is tantamount. Nay, we are partakers of the body and blood in both, according to the principles of the ancient writers. Testimonies to that effect have often been collected by learned Protestants: and therefore, for the avoiding of prolixity, I choose rather to refer[h], than to repeat. Such being the certain doctrine of the ancients, it is a vain attempt, to strain any expressions of theirs concerning the illapse of the Spirit in the Eucharist, beyond what they admitted in the other Sacrament. The substance of what they taught is the same with respect to both, only in different phrases, as the difference of the symbols required: for Baptism is not the Eucharist, though it exhibits the same graces, and does the same thing, and by the same powers, that the Eucharist does.

From the account here given, I may take notice, by the way, of the wisdom of our first Reformers, who, while they thought of inserting any prayer at all for the illapse of the Spirit, resolved to do it equally and indifferently in both the Offices; as well in the Office of Baptism[i], as in the Office for the Communion[k]:

[h] Bishop Moreton on the Sacrament, p. 568, &c. Albertinus, pp. 223, 426. Bingham, book xi. chap. 16. sect. 4.

[i] In King Edward's first Prayer-Book, A. D. 1549. 'O most merciful God our Saviour Jesu Christ... upon whom, being baptized in the river of Jordan, the Holy Ghost came down in the likeness of a dove, send down, we beseech thee, the same thy Holy Spirit, to assist us, and to be present at this our invocation of thy holy name. Sanctify this fountain of Baptism,' &c.

[k] 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit and Word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.'

N. B. If it should be asked, how they are so unto us, if they be not first absolutely so? Answ. They are

for there is, undoubtedly, as much reason and as great authority for it with respect to the former, as there is with respect to the latter. Indeed they were both thrown out afterwards, upon prudential considerations, and at the instance chiefly of two learned and judicious foreigners, whom Archbishop Cranmer called in to assist at the review of our Liturgy in 1551[l]. It was thought, perhaps, as there was no express Scripture precept, nor any clear proof of apostolical practice, either for this form or another, that therefore every church was at liberty in such cases. It might be considered further, that several centuries probably had passed, before there were any public written Liturgies at all: and the Bishops commonly, in and for their respective churches, had been left to draw up such forms as they judged most proper to times and circumstances, conformable to the analogy of faith[m]. And since an ill use had often been made, by Romanists, of those words of the Communion Office, in favour of transubstantiation[n], (for which there appeared some colour, though colour only, and owing to misconstruction and wrong inferences,) prudence might require some alteration, under such circumstances. However, in our present Offices, we have some remains of the ancient way of praying for the assistance of the Holy Spirit in both Sacraments. In our Office of Public Baptism, we have the invocation couched under general expressions: the people are admonished to call upon God the Father, that the child brought to the font may be baptized with water 'and the Holy Ghost.' Then again, 'sanctify him with the Holy Ghost,' and 'give thy Holy Spirit to this infant:' and as to the outward element, 'sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.' These passages, penned in a more reserved, general way, do yet really contain all that the more ancient invocation in Baptism amounted to.

said to be so unto us, when the beneficial effect goes along with them. See Cranmer and Thorndike, cited above, p. 264.

[l] See Wheatly on the Common-Prayer, p. 26. Collier, Vindic. of Reas. and Def. p. 150.

[m] See Bingham, book i. chap. 19. sect. 17; book xiii. chap. 5. sect. 1; book ii. chap. 6. sect. 2. Renaudot, tom. i. p. 9.

[n] See Cranmer, p. 325. Dr. Aldrich, Reply to two Oxford Discourses, pp. 8, 9.

In our Communion Service, the invocation is more obscurely intimated under a few, and those general terms: 'Grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine ... may be partakers of his most precious body and blood [o].' This was part of the ancient invocation; and it expresses the thing formerly prayed for, without specifying the particular manner, or means, viz. the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit: though that also must of course be understood and implied, upon Christian principles taught in Scripture. After all, I see no reason why it may not be justly thought as modest, and as reverent, to beg of God the Father the things which we want, understanding that he will grant them by his Holy Spirit, as to make a formal petition to him, to send his Holy Spirit upon the elements or upon the communicants; unless Scripture had particularly ordered some such special form, to be made use of in our sacramental solemnities, which it has not done [p].

It must be owned, that there was something very affecting and awful in many of the ancient forms, apt to strike the minds of an assembly, and to raise their devout affections, when properly executed with a becoming dignity, by grave and venerable men. Such was that prefatory part in several old Liturgies, 'How dreadful is this season,' &c., made use of just before the expected coming of the Holy Spirit, in order to prepare every humble communicant to wait for it with the most profound reverence and most exalted devotions. But it may be doubted, whether such forms are proper at all times and in all circumstances; and whether they might not, in some circumstances, rather obstruct than further the good ends designed by them. The more general and reserved method is certainly the less

[o] That is, partakers of the merits and virtue of the body as crucified, and blood as spilled; and partakers also of the same body considered as raised again, and mystically united with worthy receivers.

[p] 'Mirum in hisce, aliisque Orientalium Liturgiis, consensum videas circa invocationem Spiritus Sancti, ut dona faciat corpus et sanguinem Christi: de hac liturgica invocatione tamen in genuinis Apostolorum scriptis ne γρῦ.' Fabricius, Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. part. iii. in praefatione.

'Nos equidem illam Spiritus Sancti ἐπιφοίτησιν neque ad symbolorum consecrationem necessariam, nec exorandam, nec Graecorum Liturgiam ea in parte defendendam, aut imitandam esse arbitramur.' Deylingius, Observ. Miscellan. p. 199.

affecting; but yet it may be, all things considered, the surest way to keep up the dignity of the Sacraments among the generality, and to secure the sacred Offices from contempt. But I have said enough of this matter, which came in only by the way.

While I am speaking of our excellent Liturgy, it may not be amiss to take notice of another article relating to this head, wherein it may appear to some short and defective. It is very certain, that the commemoration, memorial, or annunciation of our Lord's passion, with an address to God for his propitious favour thereupon, has been a very ancient, eminent, and solemn part of the Communion Service. There is now no direct formal application of that kind in our Offices. There was in King Edward's Liturgy of 1549, in these words: 'We thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son has willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection,' &c. Why this part was struck out in the review, I know not; unless it was owing to some scruple (which however was needless) about making the memorial before God, which at that time might appear to give some umbrage to the Popish sacrifice, among such as knew not how to distinguish. However that were, we have still the sum and substance of the primitive memorial remaining in our present Offices; not all in a place, but interspersed here and there in the exhortations and prayers. In a previous exhortation, we read; 'Above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, &c. for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ both God and man,' &c. There is the sense and signification of the ancient memorial, only under a different form. In the Post-Communion, we beseech God 'to accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and to grant remission of sins to us and to the whole Church, by the merits and death of Christ Jesus.' Which words contain the substance of what was anciently the appendage to the memorial. There was besides, in most of the old Liturgies [q], a particular petition added, that the angels might

[q] See in Fabricius's Collection, pp. 36, 54, 70, 96, 147, 173, 206, 234, 265, 273, and in Renaudot's passim. Compare Apostol. Constit. lib. viii.

carry up our prayers to the high altar in heaven; and this also was inserted in King Edward's first Liturgy, but struck out at the first review. As to the altar in heaven, I shall have occasion to say more in a chapter below, and therefore pass it over here. As to the notion of angels conveying the prayers of the supplicants to the throne above, I know not whether it had any better grounds than the authority of the apocryphal book of Tobit [r], as Bucer observed [s]. It seems to have been originally a Jewish notion [t]; though a late learned writer chooses rather to derive it from the Platonic philosophy [u]: I think, improperly; for it will be hard to prove, that Plato was before Tobit, or before the book bearing his name [x]. Besides that, the Pagans were more likely to borrow such things from Jews, than the Jews from them. But be that as it will, since the notion has no certain warrant in canonical Scripture, it was prudent to strike it out of our Church Offices. Upon the whole, though all human compositions must have their defects, more or less, I am persuaded, that our Communion Service, as it now stands, is as grave, and solemn, and as judicious, as any other that can be named, be it ancient or modern. It may want some things which were well inserted in other Offices; but then it has well left out several other things, which most Liturgies are rather burdened with, than benefited. But I return.

As to the main point now in hand, it is very plain from all liturgies, and from all kinds of ancient testimonies, that the Christian world has all along believed, that the Spirit of God is invisibly present, and operates effectually in both Sacraments; as well to confer a relative holiness upon the outward symbols, as to convey the grace of sanctification to the faithful recipients. Therefore the Socinians stand condemned as to this article, by all churches, ancient or modern, as well as by Scripture itself, and the plainest reason: neither have they any plea to offer on that

cap. 13, and Pseud-Ambros. de Sacr. lib. iv. cap. 6.

[r] Tobit xii. 15.

[s] Bucer. Script. Anglican. p. 473.

[t] Cp. Testamentum Levi, in Grab. Spicileg. tom. i. p. 159.

[u] Elsner. in Graec. Testam. tom. ii. p. 117.

[x] Of Tobit, see Prideaux's Connection, part. i. p. 39. fol. edit. Fabric. Bibl. Graec. lib. iii. cap. 29. Dupin, Can. of the Old Test. p. 89.

side, which carries so much as the face of a direct argument. I am aware, that they may have something to plead obliquely, while arguing against the existence, or personality, or divinity of the Holy Ghost, or against any ordinary operations from above upon the minds of men, to enlighten or sanctify them: and whatever they may have to plead in respect to those previous points, will remotely affect the present question. But it is not my business here, to run out into those preliminary inquiries, almost foreign to the particular subject I am upon, and fitter to make distinct and separate treatises, than to be brought in here. As to direct arguments, I can think of few or none[y] at present, unless we may reckon that for one, which charges our doctrine in this particular, as making the Sacraments charms and spells; an objection built upon manifest calumny or misconception, and looking more like buffoonery than serious argument, especially as worded by some of that side. One of them writes thus: 'When St. Austin defined a sacrament to be the outward visible sign of an inward invisible grace or energy, the good Father should have considered, that this is a definition of a charm, not of a Gospel Sacrament: for a charm is a bare outward visible sign, that which has no natural or real agreement with the effect.... They have turned the Gospel Sacraments into charms and spells[z].' The same trifling impertinence might as justly be urged against Naaman's being healed of his leprosy by washing in Jordan[a]; or against Hezekiah's being cured by a lump of figs[b]; or against the blind man's receiving sight by the means of clay and spittle and washing in the pool of Siloam[c]. We place no more virtue in the naked symbols, than in the meanest instruments whatever, which God may at any time please to make use of, and sanctify to high and holy purposes. Those instruments in themselves do nothing: it is God that does all, in and

[y] The argument drawn against present benefits from the word remembrance has been obviated above, ch. iv. p. 70. I shall only hint further, that remembering, in this case, is not opposed to a thing's being present, but to its being forgot, as spiritual and invisible benefits easily may, though near at hand all the time. Vid. Nourrii Apparat. tom. i. p. 411.

[z] Trinitarian Scheme of Religion, pp. 24, 25, printed in the year 1692.

[a] 2 Kings v. 14.

[b] 2 Kings xx. 7. Isa. xxxviii. 21.

[c] John ix. 7.

through the appointed use of them. He that blasphemes or derides the certain workings of God, or of the Spirit of God, upon the souls or bodies of men, under the names of charms, spells, enchantments, or the like, (as the Jews derided our Lord's miracles,) seems to forget the reverence due to Divine Majesty, and the respect which we owe to high and holy things. But to put the kindest and most favourable construction we can upon the objection as here worded, it is charging St. Austin and all the primitive churches, and their followers, with what they are notoriously known, not only never to have taught, but constantly to have disclaimed. They never do attribute to the bare elements the works of grace, but constantly ascribe them to the powerful hand of God, working in or with the elements. If that be working by charms or spells, let any man tell us, what supernatural or preternatural works of God are not as justly liable to the same imputation.

If the purport of the objection be to reject all such Divine operations as we here suppose upon moral agents, as not consistent with human liberty; that is a more general question, previous to what we are now upon, and therefore in a great measure foreign to the point in hand. It is sufficient to say, that the general doctrine of grace is so fully established in the New Testament, that no Christian can consistently reject it. As to the manner of it, it is not for us to presume to explain it: but we are certain it is wrought in a moral way, in a way consistent with moral agency and human liberty. We know the fact: we need no more. If any man will undertake to demonstrate a priori, that there can be no medium between irresistible impressions and none at all, or that God cannot sanctify, or purify, or enlighten the soul of man, in any degree, without making him a machine, he may perhaps deserve to be heard; but in the mean while Scripture, express Scripture, will deserve our attention, and will command the faith of every true disciple of Christ.

Some perhaps may think it an objection to what has been here pleaded, that grace is also promised, sometimes to prayer, sometimes to faith, and sometimes to hearing, and therefore is not

peculiar to the Sacraments: for it has been suggested, that 'the spiritual eating of Christ is common to all places, as well as to the Lord's table[d].' This I have touched upon before[e], and shall only add here, that we do not confine God's grace to the Sacraments; neither do we assert any peculiar grace, as appropriate to them only: but what we assert is, some peculiar degree of the same graces, or some peculiar certainty, or constancy, as to the effect, in the due use of those means[f]. And if the Divine graces, more or less, go along with all the Divine ordinances, well may they be supposed to go along with those, which are the most solemn and most exalted of any, and have also more of a federal nature in them; as has been hinted above[g], and will be proved at large in the chapter here following.

CHAP. XI.

Of the federal or covenanting Nature of the Holy EUCHARIST.

IT is the prevailing doctrine of Divines, that the Service of the holy Communion carries in it something of a federal nature, is a kind of covenanting or stipulating act; not making a new covenant, but covenanting anew, confirming or renewing the stipulation before entered into at our Baptism. For the clearing of this important point, it will be proper, 1. To premise something of covenants in general between God and man. 2. To specify the ancient forms or methods of contracting under the Old Testament. 3. To descend to the latter forms of doing the same thing under the New Testament, by the Sacraments thereunto belonging, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

1. The Divine goodness and condescension is such, in all his dealings with mankind, that he considers always what is best for them, and may most help their infirmities. With these

[d] Hales's Tracts, p. 57.

[e] See above, p. 189, &c.

[f] 'Verbum et Sacramenta in eo conveniunt, quod ambo gratiam regenerationis offerant et exhibeant: sed quod nonnunquam Sacramentis peculiariter adscribi videtur, id inde est, quod fides, in Sacramentis, hanc gratiam videat clarius, apprehendat fortius, teneat certius.' Voss. de Sacram. p. 251.

[g] See above, p. 191.

gracious views (while he is absolute Lord over them, and might issue out his sovereign commands to all, without admitting any mortal to contract for rewards, or to strike any league with him) he is pleased to enter into covenants with men, giving and taking assurances, and, as it were, binding both himself and them, in order to draw them the more strongly to him, and to engage them to look after their own everlasting happiness. Not that God thereby divests himself of his right over them, or that men have a right to refuse the covenant proposed to them, or would not be justly punishable for such refusal[h]: for indeed they are under a previous indispensable obligation to comply; and the refusing it would deserve very severe punishment[i]. But the entering into covenant produces a closer relation and a stronger tie, and is much more engaging and attractive many ways, than naked precepts could be[k]; as will be evident of itself to any man that reflects, and I need not enlarge upon it.

In covenants between God and man, there is not, as in common covenants, an equal and mutual meeting of each other, or a joint concurrence: but God is the first mover to invite and propound; and man comes in after, sooner or later, to accept and conclude. 'We love God, because he first loved us:' 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us[l].' And our Lord says to his Disciples, 'Ye have not [first] chosen me, but I have [first] chosen you,' &c.[m]. Another thing observable is, that there are not here, as in covenants between man and man, mutual advantages, or benefits reciprocal; but all the advantage or benefit, properly so called, accrues to one party only, because the other is too perfect to receive any. Nevertheless, there is something analogous to benefits, or what may be considered as such, accruing to the Divine Majesty; namely, external honour and glory, and such delight as he is conceived constantly to enjoy in the exercise of his goodness, wisdom, power, and other his

[h] See Puffendorf, Jus feciale Divinum, sect. xx. p. 92, &c. Lat. edit. p. 87. Engl. edit. Abp. Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 12, &c.

[i] Matt. x. 14, 15; xxii. 7. Luke xiv. 21—24.

[k] Vid. Hoornbeeck de Foedere Ecclesiastico, Exercit. Theolog. tom. iii. p. 640.

[l] 1 John iv. 19, 10.

[m] John xv. 16.

attributes or perfections. Neither does this circumstantial difference, arising from the infinite disparity of the parties contracting, at all affect the essence of the covenant supposed to be made between them. For a covenant is, in its general nature, (as Baron Puffendorf defines it[n],) an union, consent, and agreement of two wills about the same thing[o]: and if God proposes such and such terms, and man accepts them, there is then a formal covenant struck between them. God conditionally offers advantages on his side; and man covenants to pay a suitable homage, adoration, and service, as required.

That God has transacted, and does yet daily transact, covenants with mankind in succession, shall be shewn presently. Only I may here hint by the way, that many considerable Divines have supposed also a previous covenant between God the Father and God the Son, in the affair of man's salvation. There are several things hinted in holy Scripture, which look like an agreement, or covenant, that upon our Lord's undertaking to be Mediator, and performing what belongs to it, a reconciliation should ensue between God the Father and mankind. The texts, which chiefly seem to countenance that notion, are collected into one view by the excellent Puffendorf, to whom, for brevity sake, I choose to refer the reader[p].

2. I proceed to observe, that God has, time after time, transacted covenants with men, and under various formalities. There was a covenant of life made with man in Paradise, in his state of innocency[q]; which commonly goes under the name of the first covenant, or old covenant, and which continued for a very short space. To that immediately succeeded the second covenant, or new covenant, called also the covenant of grace, and made with lapsed man, in and through Christ Jesus. It commenced from

[n] Puffendorf, Jus fecial. sect. xx.

[o] Cp. Deylingius, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 328, 329. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 240.

[p] Puffendorf, Jus fecial. sect. xxxvii. p. 144. Lat. p. 129. Engl. edit. Cp. Dodwell, Diss. Cyprian. p. 448. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. pp. 240, 241, 242. In Zornius may be seen references to a multitude of writers, who have considered that article.

[q] See this proved and explained by Bishop Bull, Appendix ad Animad. xvii., and Discourse concerning the first Covenant, Opp. Posth. vol. iii. p. 1065, &c. Compare Puffendorf, Jus fecial. sect. xxiv.

old time, in the world's infancy, as St. Paul testifies [r]; though not clearly revealed nor fully executed till the days of the Gospel, but considered as executed from the beginning, so far forth as to be available for the remission of sin, in all ages, to men fitly qualified according to the terms of it. Besides these two eminent and general covenants, God entered into other inferior or more special covenants, (together with renewals also of this,) as with Noah [s], with Abraham [t], with Isaac [u], with Jacob [x], with Moses and Aaron [y], and with Phinehas [z], and their families after them. The legal covenant, or Sinai covenant, was made between God and the Israelites, by the hand of Moses [a]. It was in itself a temporal covenant, containing only temporal promises: but in its retired, mystical meaning, it figured out the spiritual covenant before made, and was a shadow of good things to come [b]. That external covenant (representing as through a glass darkly the internal) was often renewed with the people of the Hebrews: as in the time of Joshua at Sichem [c], and in the reigns of Asa [d] and of Ahab [e], and of Joash [f], Hezekiah [g], and Josiah [h]. This I note to obviate a common mistake, as if, because a covenant has been once granted and fixed on God's part, it may not be properly said to be regranted, or renewed, with a fleeting body of men, as new generations come up. Indeed it seems highly expedient, that such covenants should be

[r] Tit. i. 2. Πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, before ancient times. Vid. Bull, Opp. Posth. vol. ii. p. 591. Cp. Rom. xvi. 25. Coloss. i. 26. 1 Pet. i. 20.

[s] Gen. vi. 18; ix. 9—18. In the first instance, there was express engagement on one side, tacit on the other. See Le Clerc in loc. In the second, there appears to have been no more than simple engagement on one side. But in the instances following, there were mutual or reciprocal engagements, tacit or express.

[t] Gen. xii. 2, 3; xv. 18; xvii. 2—22. Ecclus. xliv. 20.

[u] Gen. xvii. 19; xxi. 2; xxvi. 2, 3. Ecclus. xliv. 22. Psalm cv. 9.

[x] Gen. xxviii. 13, 14, 20, 21, 22; xxxv. 9, &c. Ecclus. xliv. 23.

[y] Exod. vi. 4—7; iv. 28. Ecclus. xlv. 7, 15.

[z] Numb. xxv. 12, 13. Here the covenant was conditional, (as appears by the forfeiture of the priesthood afterwards,) and accepting the priesthood was accepting the conditions: therefore, in this instance, the engagement was reciprocal, amounting to a formal covenant.

[a] Exod. xix. 3; xxiv. 8. Deut. v. 5. Gal. iii. 19.

[b] Heb. viii. 5; x. 1.

[c] Joshua xxiv. 14—25.

[d] 2 Chron. xv. 12, &c.

[e] 1 Kings xviii. 39.

[f] 2 Chron. xxiii. 16, &c.

[g] 2 Chron. xxix. 10.

[h] 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, 32. 2 Kings xxiii. 3.

renewed frequently, because the men coming up in succession are new, though God is always the same; and it is proper that the contracting parties should make it their own act and deed. The stipulations, which I have now been speaking of, were between God and his people collectively considered. But besides these, there were also standing forms of covenanting between God and particular persons. Such were sacrifices in general, and such also were the Sacraments of the old Law, and more especially Circumcision and the Passover, to which respectively the Christian Sacraments succeeded.

That sacrifices were federal rites, is a point generally allowed by the learned, and which I need not here be at the pains to prove[i]. What I shall more particularly insist on shall be the Jewish Sacraments previous to ours, the two most eminent, just before named.

I begin with Circumcision; which was manifestly a federal rite, a formal stipulation between God and man; carrying in it mutual engagements of blessings on one hand, and service on the other. It is said of Circumcision, 'This is my covenant,' &c., and 'it shall be a token of the covenant;' and a little after, 'my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant;' and the 'uncircumcised shall be cut off,' as having 'broken my covenant[k].' All which imply that it was a covenanting rite, a contract, or stipulation, passed between two parties, namely, between God and man. But for the clearer apprehending of this matter, we may consider in Circumcision, as in every other sacrament, a sign, and a thing signified, or both together, as one transaction. If the name be applied to the bare sign, then Circumcision is not a stipulation, but the token of it; and if it be applied to the thing signified, it means the terms of agreement: but if it be applied to the whole transaction between both parties, then it is formally the contract or stipulation entered into here and there. So that according to different views, the word circumcision may either stand for the sign, token, seal of

[i] See Mede, Opp. p. 370. Dodwell, One Altar, &c. c. vii. pp. 145, &c. 136, &c. Archbishop Potter on Church Government, p. 266. Spencer de Leg. Hebr. tom. ii. p. 766. edit. Cant.

[k] Gen. xvii. 9—14.

the contract, or for the contract itself, passing under those forms. This observation will be of use hereafter, for the clearer apprehension of the two Christian Sacraments; which in like manner are either signs and seals of a covenant, or the very acts of covenanting, according as you understand the word sacrament in a stricter or larger sense. But I pass on. That Circumcision carried in it a bond of obligation on man's part, is very plain, since it made a man a 'debtor to the whole law[l].' And that it likewise carried in it a correspondent engagement on God's part, is as plain from God's promises made at the institution of it[m], and from its being styled a 'seal of the righteousness of faith[n]:' that is to say, a kind of instrument, by which God sealed or assured to the parties his acceptance of such righteousness, as Abraham was accepted in; and such as was signified under that outward rite, styled in Scripture the 'circumcision of the heart[o].' But it would be tedious to dwell longer upon a by-point, and one so often discussed by knowing and judicious Divines[p].

The other ordinary Sacrament of the Jewish church was the Passover. That it was a federal rite, may be strongly argued from several topics, which I shall barely touch upon in passing. 1. From its being a proper sacrifice; a point now concluded among the learned[q], and scarce admitting of any further dispute. 2. From its typical and mysterious nature, pointing to Christ and his sufferings, and the fruits thereof, in many observable circumstances[r], too long to mention in this place. 3. From

[l] Gal. v. 3. Timothy's case was singular, founded on particular circumstances, and can be no impeachment of the general maxim.

[m] Gen. xvii. 7.

[n] Rom. iv. 11.

[o] Rom. ii. 29. Compare Deut. x. 16; xxx. 6. Jerem. iv. 4.

[p] Bucer, Script. Anglican. p. 608, &c. Buddaeus, Miscell. Sacr. tom. iii. p. 8, &c. Witsius, Oecon. Foed. p. 700, &c. Towerson on the Sacraments, part iv. p. 47, &c. Hoornbeeck, Socin. Cp. tom. iii. lib. 3. p. 231, &c.

[q] Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, ch. ii. Bochart. Hierozoic. tom. ii. p. 573. Hottinger in Notis ad Tho. Goodwin, p. 535. Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. i. c. 13. pp. 146, 147. Reland, Antiq. Vet. Heb. par. iii. p. 378. Bishop Patrick in Exod. xii. 27. Clericus in Num. ix. 7. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. p. 295. Deylingius, Obs. Sacr. tom. iii. p. 332; tom. i. p. 287. Moshemius, Not. ad Cudworth. pp. 18, 19.

[r] Witsius, Oecon. Foederum, pp. 722—730. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. lib. 3. cap. 9. p. 415, &c.

the case of the other Jewish Sacraments extraordinary, such as the manna, and the rock, &c., which remitted men to Christ, and were a kind of spiritual food [s] to as many as were worthy; importing a federal relation to Almighty God, and a communion with him. 4. From express texts, intimating that the Passover was intended as a sign, and a token, and a memorial, to keep up a constant sense of, and regard for, 'the law of the Lord [t],' and for that deliverance, by which God confirmed unto himself that people to be his 'people for ever [u].' So that in that service were implied the people's engaging to 'keep the law of God,' and God's engaging to be their God, while they did so; which two things taken together make up the formal notion of a contract, or covenant.

From the Jewish Sacraments we may pass on to the Christian Sacraments, analogous to them, but exceeding them in several respects, as being less burdensome, and of clearer signification and application, and made essential parts of an higher and more excellent institution. Method requires that I should first say something of Baptism, the initiating Sacrament, by which a man ordinarily first enters into covenant with God, becoming a Christian [x]. That Baptism is a federal rite, a formal stipulation between God and the party baptized, might be probably argued many ways [y]. But for brevity sake, I shall confine myself to the consideration of one express text; which I render thus: 'The

[s] 1 Cor. x. 1—4. See above, p. 129.

[t] Exod. xiii. 9, 16. See Pelling on the Lord's Supper, pp. 63, 91, 112, 253.

[u] 2 Sam. vii. 24.

[x] Some have been willing to suppose, that if a man embraces Christianity, and fulfils the terms, viz. faith and repentance, he is ipso facto entered into covenant, without any formal stipulation. But Scripture is plain: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Mark xvi. 16. And, 'Except one be born of water, &c. he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' John iii. 5. The stipulation is as necessary as the rest: or, not to dispute about words, it is at least part of the terms of acceptance, and of true Christian obedience, and so of evangelical repentance; which, according to its full notion, is but another name for evangelical obedience. So that it is in vain to speak of Christian repentance or obedience as entire, without taking in conformity to the Sacraments, which is implied in the other, as a part is included in the whole. Compare Archbishop Potter on Church Government, pp. 16, 17.

[y] Vid. Dodwell, Cyprian. Dissertat. xiii. sect. 42. p. 442, &c. Vossius de Baptism. Disp. iv. Thess. iii. p. 269.

like figure whereunto Baptism doth now save us; not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the stipulation [ἐπερώτημα] of a good conscience to Godward, by the resurrection of Christ[z].' Here we have the very doctrine which I am pleading for, that Baptism is a federal rite, a stipulation with God. So Beza and Grotius, and other critics of best note[a], interpret the place, and give very substantial reasons for it, which I need not here recite. I shall only add, that the ancients constantly taught, that Baptism was a covenanting rite, a solemn form of stipulating with God[b], the seal of the Lord[c]; and that it succeeded in the room of Circumcision, being therefore called the Christian circumcision, 'made without hands[d],' or the spiritual circumcision[e], as a figure and instrument of it.

Having thus far cleared the way, we may now proceed to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the last of the four. And since it appears that the three former Sacraments were federal rites, that single consideration affords us a presumptive argument that this is so likewise. But there are several other considerations, that more directly prove it; and these are what I am going to lay down in their order:

1. That the eucharistical service is a federal service, follows directly from what has been before proved, that it imports and implies a real and vital communion between God and every worthy receiver. For what can communion, in this case, import less than covenanting? The least that it implies is a reciprocal intercourse of blessings on one hand, and homage on the other; which, in effect, is the same thing with mutual stipulations[f]. If

[z] 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[a] They are most of them numbered by Wolfius upon the text, who closes in with them.

[b] Tertullian styles it 'obsignatio fidei.' De Poenitent. cap. vi. 'Testatio fidei, sponsio salutis.' De Bapt. capt. vi. 'Anima non lavatione, sed responsione sancitur.' De Resur. Carn. cap. xlviii. 'Fidei pactio.' De Pudic. cap. ix. Cp. Basil. de Spir. Sancto, cap. xii. p. 24. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xl. p. 641. Pseudo-Dionys. Areop. cap. iii. Facund. lib. iv. p. 62. Compare Bingham, xi. 6. 7.

[c] See Bingham, xi. 1. 6.

[d] Coloss. ii. 11, 12. Basil. Homil. in Baptism. p. 115. tom. ii. Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. xl. Cyrill. Alexandr. in Joan. lib. iv. cap. 7. p. 432.

[e] Vid. Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 222. Cyprian. Epist. lxiv. p. 161.

[f] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pp. 27, 103, 104, 105.

it be said, that it is only performing, or executing, on both sides, what was before stipulated in Baptism, it is obvious to reply, that such performances, on both sides, carry in them the strongest assurances of a continuation of the same, and so amount, in just construction, to a repetition, or renewal, of the reciprocal engagements.

2. The federal nature of the Eucharist may be further argued from what learned men have shewn of the customs of divers nations, in drinking either blood, or wine instead of blood, for the ratifying of covenants[g]. Such kind of drinking was a noted federal rite long before the institution of the Eucharist: a consideration which, taken alone, affords a strong presumptive argument of the federal nature of this Sacrament, but if taken together with our Lord's own comment upon it, in the words, 'Drink ye all of this, for this is the new covenant,' &c., can leave but little room for any reasonable dispute about it.

3. But we may argue, still more directly, from our Lord's own words, 'This cup, or wine, is my blood of the new covenant[h],' and 'This is the new covenant in my blood[i].' I render διαθήκη, 'covenant,' rather than 'testament,' because such appears to be the constant sense of it in the Septuagint[k], as also in the New Testament, excepting perhaps one place of the Epistle to the Hebrews[l]. Indeed, either the name testament, or the name of covenant, is applicable to the same thing, considered under different views; as the new covenant is of a mixed or middle kind, in some respects federal, and in some testamentary, and, as it were, a compound of both: for which reason it has been indifferently and promiscuously called either a federal testament,

[g] Grotius in Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. Spencer. de Leg. Hebr. p. 614. edit. Cant. Zornius, Bibliothec. Antiquaria Exeg. p. 615.

[h] Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24.

[i] Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 25.

[k] 'Notandum quod brith, verbum Hebraicum, Aquila *συνθήκην*, id est, pactum, interpretatur: LXX semper *διαθήκην*, id est, testamentum. Et in plerisque scripturarum locis testamentum non voluntatem defunctorum sonare, sed pactum viventium.' Hieron. in Mal. c. ii. 1816. Cp. Salmas. de Transubstant. p. 541.

[l] Heb. ix. 16, 17. Vid. Wolfius, Crit. Cur. in loc. Towerson on the Sacraments, part i. p. 14, &c.

'Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotio passim *συνθήκη*, pactum, foedus. LXX saepius *διαθήκη*, testamentum.' Montfauc. Lexic. ad Hexapl.

or a testamentary covenant, to intimate its compound nature [m]. But I take the federal notion of it to be the primary or principal part of the idea, and to suit best with the then prevailing sense of the word διαθήκη [n].

Our Lord's expressions in the institution are plainly federal expressions; as will appear by comparing them with other the like expressions made use of in the Old Testament in federal solemnities [o]. When God instituted the federal rite of Circumcision, he said; 'This is my covenant, which ye shall keep [p],' &c. Therefore, as sure as Circumcision was a federal rite of the Jewish Church, so sure is it that the Eucharist is a federal solemnity among Christians. When God struck up a covenant with the people of the Hebrews, by the sprinkling of blood, the form ran, 'Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made [q],' &c. As much as to say, 'Look upon yourselves as obliged by these federal solemnities to observe all the commands which I have here delivered.' Accordingly, it is observable, that the people there instantly promised and engaged 'to do all that the Lord had said, and to be obedient [r]:' which was expressing their formal consent, and executing, as it were, their counterpart in the stipulation [s]. Now as our blessed Lord, in the institution of the Eucharist, addressed himself to Jews, who

[m] 'Nostrum foedus cum Deo non purum aut simplex quoddam foedus est, sed habens quiddam mixtum ex foedere et testamento. Christus in manu habet id, de quo pactus est cum hominibus Deus, aeternam nimirum haereditatem: quoniam autem hic non nisi moriendo nobis illud jus acquirit, idcirco quod ad Christum ipsum attinet, pactum istud inter Deum et homines initum, speciem quandam testamenti refert, quasi ipse moriens aeterni regni nos fecerit haeredes.' Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 239. See Twells's Examination of New Text and Version, part ii. p. 64.

[n] Vid. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 238.

[o] Exod. xxiv. 8. Gen. xvii. 10. See Nature and Obligation of the Christian Sacraments, vol. v. pp. 91, 102, &c.

[p] Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διατηρήσεις. Gen. xvii. 10.

[q] Ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετο Κύριος, &c. Exod. xxiv. 8. Vid. Patrick in loc. et Bucherus, Ant. Evang. ad Matth. xxvi. 28. pp. 386, 389.

[r] Exod. xxiv. 3, 7. Compare Deut. v. 27.

[s] Other like instances of express consent on man's part may be seen in Gen. xxviii. 20, &c. Exod. xix. 8. Josh. xxiv. 21, 24, 25. 2 Chron. xv. 14, 15; xxiii. 16; xxix. 10; xxxiv. 31. Ezr. x. 3. Nehem. ix. 38; x. 28, 29, 39.

had been accustomed to such federal phrases, it is highly reasonable to believe, that he intended the phrases in such a sense as they would be apt to take them in, namely, in a federal sense.

Socinus, to elude this argument, pretends[t], that our Lord's words in that case may mean only, that this sacramental cup, or wine, is a memorial or commemoration of the blood once shed, and of the covenant therein founded, or thereby executed. But if we have hitherto gone upon sure grounds, it will be easy to throw off those laboured subtilties. For since it is manifest, from the express doctrine of the Apostle, that the Eucharist is not barely a memorial, but a communion also of the blood, and of what goes along with it; it will undeniably follow, that the same Eucharist is not merely a memorial of the covenant, going along with the blood, but a communion also, or participation of it, on man's side: and if there be a participation on one side, there must be also a communication on the other side; and so both parts are complete. God re-admits us into covenant, and we re-accept, under this appointed form, under this holy solemnity; and thus the mutual league of amity is re-established, the compact renewed and confirmed. Every worthy receiver, as often as he symbolically receives the blood, revives and recruits his interest in our Lord's passion, and in the covenant thereupon founded: he takes new hold of it, and binds himself over to it by more and stronger ties; which is what we mean by renewing the baptismal covenant in this other Sacrament of the holy Eucharist. How

[t] 'Hinc apparet, cum ipsum poculum novum testamentum esse in suo sanguine Christus dixisse legitur, aliud nihil intelligendum esse, quam vini ex illo poculo potu, novi testamenti quod nobiscum suo sanguine interveniente pepigit (seu potius sui sanguinis, qui ad novum testamentum confirmandum fusus fuit) commemorationem fieri.... Ipsi bibentes, novum testamentum praedicant et commemorant: idque secum pactum fuisse, aliis testantur ac significant. ... Sicque sibi persuasum esse indicant.' Socin. de Usu et Fine Coenae Domini, p. 36, alias 759. Opp. tom. i. Cp. Catech. Racov. sect. vi. c. 4. p. 239. Schlichting. in 1 Cor. xi. 25.

Crellius's account is not much different, in making it to be a kind of declaration or testification of our partaking of, or pertaining to the new covenant. ['Testamentum vero, sive foedus novum ideo appellatur, quia sit solennis ritus, quo omnes Christiani in perpetuum profiteri debeant, se ad novum foedus pertinere.' Crellii Ethic. p. 352; cp. 353.] This is just such another evasion, as the interpreting 'communion' by 'a declaration of communion,' and admits of the like answer. See above, p. 183, &c.

insignificant, unedifying, and comfortless, in comparison, is a bare commemoration! It neither answers the force of our Lord's words, further interpreted by St. Paul, nor the purposes of holiness, nor the nature, ends, or uses of the spiritual life, nor God's usual methods of dealing with his Church and people in all former ages.

4. The federal nature of the Eucharist may be further confirmed from the very observable analogy, which St. Paul takes notice of and illustrates[u], between the Sacrament of the holy Communion, and the sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles. They were of a federal nature, by the Apostle's account of them; and so must this be also, if it was in that very view that he formed the comparison, or parallel. I beg leave here to use the words of a very judicious and learned Prelate of our Church, who says; 'In the ancient sacrifices both among Jews and heathens, one part of the victim was offered upon the altar, and another reserved to be eaten of those persons in whose name the sacrifice was made: this was accounted a sort of partaking of God's table, and was a federal rite, whereby he owned his guests to be in his favour, and under his protection, as they by offering sacrifices acknowledged him to be their God[v]. . . . The Lord's Supper was always believed to succeed in the place of sacrifices[x]. . . . Eating the Lord's Supper was the same rite in the Christian Church with eating the things offered in sacrifice among the Jews and heathens. It is an act of communion or fellowship with God, at whose table we are said to be entertained; and therefore it is declared to be inconsistent with eating the Gentile sacrifices, which is an act of communion with devils, to whom these sacrifices were offered[y].' From these plain and undeniable principles it directly follows, that the Eucharist is, at the lowest, a federal rite: I say, at the lowest, because more than that has been proved, as I conceive, in a former chapter, which treats of 1 Cor. x. 16.

A late Divine of our Church, in a little piece of his upon this subject, has a distinction worth the examining, which I shall here give the reader in his own words: 'The Lord's Supper is not

[u] 1 Cor. x. 16.
[v] Archb. Potter on Church Government, p. 266.
[x] Ibid. p. 265.
[y] Ibid. pp. 269, 270.

properly the federal rite, or the covenant rite, but the memorial of it: the death of Christ was the federal rite, and the Lord's Supper is the memorial of Christ's death. But though the Lord's Supper is neither a proper sacrifice, nor the great, original, or primitive federal rite, strictly speaking; yet being a feast upon a sacrifice, (or in commemoration of that great sacrifice of the death of Christ, which was the true and proper federal or covenant rite,) it may be styled a federal rite, in the same sense in which the Jews' eating of their sacrifices was or might be esteemed to be such a rite, viz. an open profession of their being in covenant with God, and having devoted themselves to his service as his peculiar people[z].' I said, this distinction was worth the examining. I judge it not accurate, nor indeed right upon the whole: but it appears to be well aimed; and it points out to us some difficulties which seem to want a clearer solution. The distinction would have answered better, had it been made to run between covenant and covenant, (than between federal rites, proper and improper,) or between covenant considered at large and particular stipulations. If the death of Christ is properly a federal rite at all, it is with respect to the covenant made between God the Father and Christ Jesus, in behalf of mankind collectively considered, and not with respect to the several stipulations coming after, and made between God and particular men. The Eucharist may as properly be said to be a federal rite with regard to these particular stipulations, as the death of Christ can be supposed to be with regard to the new covenant at large. But I much question, whether the death of Christ ought to be called a federal rite at all; which appears to be too low and too diminutive a name for it: especially considering the ill use which the Socinians have been apt to make of it. The death of Christ is really the price of our redemption, the valuable consideration, whereupon the covenant was founded, and in which it stands. It was submitted to, once for all, and is never to be repeated; which sufficiently distinguishes it from whatever has hitherto passed under the name of a federal rite,

[z] Mapletoft's Plain Account of the Lord's Supper, p. 138.

and shews it to be a thing of much higher consideration. Therefore, let not the name of federal rite be so improperly applied to what was no rite at all, nor can ever come under the common or proper notion of a religious or federal rite. But the sacrifices and sacraments of the Jewish Church were properly federal rites: and since the Christian Sacraments are allowed to be federal rites in as proper a sense as those were, that is sufficient to our purpose. They were ceremonious observances, made use of in stipulations between God and man; and so are these: not essential to the stipulation 'necessitate medii,' but 'necessitate praecepti;' not in themselves, but as required, and made necessary to us by free and voluntary appointment. However, they are more than an open profession of our being in covenant with God: they are covenanting rites, or stipulating acts, by which our stipulation with God either commences, (as in Baptism,) or is renewed, as in the other Sacrament, which we are now upon.

The author last cited allows the Eucharist to be a feast upon a sacrifice, and so of consequence a federal feast. This is a notion which may deserve a more particular consideration in this place; and the rather because it was very plausibly advanced by an eminent Divine of our Church near a hundred years ago[a], and long passed current among divines and critics of the first rank, both here and abroad, but has been lately disputed by several learned hands, with great acuteness, though perhaps not with equal solidity. It may be a piece of justice due to a great man, and to an important cause, to examine fairly, but as briefly also as may be, the strength of what has been objected to a prevailing notion, which for some time appeared, and still appears, to carry in it the features of truth. The notion, in short, is this; that the Eucharist, considered in its spiritual and mystical view, is a feast upon a sacrifice, (viz. the sacrifice once offered upon the cross,) bearing some analogy to the Jewish sacrificial feasts, which were figures or shadows of this true spiritual feeding. For as those were banquets upon typical sacrifices, this is a banquet upon the real sacrifice, to

[a] Dr. Cudworth, True Notion of the Lord's Supper, A.D. 1642, first edit.

which they pointed: and as those banquets were federal directly, with respect to the legal covenant; so is this banquet federal with respect to the evangelical covenant, formerly couched under the legal one. This, I think, is the sum and substance of Dr. Cudworth's True Notion of the Lord's Supper. Next let us examine what has been objected to it.

The first considerable author that appeared against it, was a learned Divine of our own [b], who had an hypothesis to serve, of which I shall say nothing here, reserving it for the next chapter, where it shall be examined at large. Most of his objections against Dr. Cudworth's notion belong to that hypothesis of a material sacrifice, and therefore may here be passed over. I shall only take notice of one thing objected, namely, that neither priests nor people ever feasted on any sacrifices, which they had not offered before; therefore Dr. Cudworth's notion suits not with the ancient sacrificial feasts [c]. But it is easy to reply, that one disagreeing circumstance, found among many resembling ones, is not sufficient to overturn the analogy: besides, in this very case, the Christian feast, or feastings, upon what was offered by the true High Priest Christ Jesus, very fitly answer, in the analogy, to the Jewish feastings upon what had been offered by their typical priests, or high priest: so that I see no force at all in the objection.

Another learned writer, some years after, expressed his dislike of Dr. Cudworth's notion, and argued against it as far as either wit or learning could supply: I shall here consider his objections:

1. He intimates, as if it were absurd that Christians 'should feast upon something that is a sacrifice, and not offered [d].' But were not Christ's body and blood offered? That is the sacrifice which Christians feast upon in the Eucharist, according to Dr. Cudworth: they feast upon the passion.

2. It is further pleaded, that Dr. Cudworth's notion seems 'much of a piece with that conceit of the Calvinists, that we receive the natural body of Christ in the Eucharist, though as

[b] Hickes's Christian Priesthood, p. 165. I use the third edition of 1711.

[c] Hickes, ibid. p. 170.

[d] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 338, alias 344.

far distant from us as heaven is from the earth[e].' But that conceit, as it is called, is a very sober truth, if understood of receiving the natural body into closer mystical union, as explained in a preceding chapter. However, Dr. Cudworth's notion of a banquet relates not to the body considered as glorified, but to the body considered as crucified, in which respect only it is eaten; so that this objection may be looked upon as foreign.

3. It is further objected by the same learned author, that 'upon this supposition our Saviour made a feast upon the sacrifice, before the sacrifice had been offered[f].' And why might he not, especially when the time was so near approaching, and the sacrifice just going to be offered, that it might well be considered as a thing done? This objection however affects only the first and original Eucharist, not the succeeding ones: and the like objection might be as justly urged against the original passover, as differing in its nature and notion from the passovers that succeeded. It might be pleaded, for instance, that the paschal feast was no memorial, no passover, because the first passover (which was the pattern for the following ones) was previous[g] to the great transaction commemorated in it, previous to the passing over the dwellings of the Hebrews. But such kind of arguing in that Sacrament would be justly rejected as frivolous or captious, since there was no more difference between the original passover and the later ones, than the necessary difference of circumstances required. Such is the case also with respect to the original Eucharist, and the later Eucharist: the same kind of prolepsis will equally solve the difficulty, whether here or there.

4. It is objected, that it 'cannot be said that the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice,' unless it be allowed either that the bare elements are a sacrifice, or else that they are transubstantiated into the real body[h]. But a symbolical or spiritual feast upon a sacrifice (which is all that Dr. Cudworth maintains) may very well be supposed without either: the sacrificial feast, which we here plead for, is not a feast of the mouth, but of the mind; not

[e] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 338, alias 344.

[f] Ibid. part ii. pref. p. 3.

[g] See Exod. xii. 21, &c.

[h] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pref. p. 4.

a bodily banquet, but a banquet of the soul, upon the fruits of the death of Christ.

5. It is objected, that Christ's crucified body, and blood shed, are now no more, have no being as such, and therefore there can be no feast upon them; consequently, it is but an airy notion to imagine any such feast or sacrifice[i]. To which we may reply, that though the crucified body, as such, is not, and though the blood shed is not, yet the fruits remain, and ever will remain, as a feast for good men here and hereafter: but as to oral manducation, either of the natural body, or of the 'res sacramenti,' (whatever it is supposed to be,) and as to a material feast, and a material sacrifice in the Eucharist, those indeed have been favourite notions among many, but are not sufficiently supported by Scripture or antiquity. I meet with nothing more, in the last learned writer, against Dr. Cudworth's explication of the Lord's Supper. But I may note, by the way, that whereas it had been before objected, that the notion was entirely new and singular, this learned gentleman is so ingenuous as to own, 'that the ancients did sometimes speak of receiving the Sacrament, as of a banquet upon what had been first offered to God[k],' and with some allusion also to the feasts upon the peace offerings under the Law[l]. And I may add, that the ancient testimonies referred to plainly shew, that those ancients spoke of a banquet upon the things signified, (not upon the signs only,) and upon the real sacrifice, not upon the bare memorial: so that Dr. Cudworth's notion accords well with those ancients.

From our own Divines I may next proceed to some learned foreigners, of the Lutheran way, who have also, now lately, expressed some dissatisfaction with respect to Dr. Cudworth's hypothesis: for though they readily approve of his rejecting any corporeal or material sacrifice in the Eucharist, yet finding that his notion is not favourable to local presence and oral manducation, they also have shewn some inclination to discredit it, or, if it might be, to confute it.

[i] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pref. p. 4.
[k] Ibid. part i. p. 338, alias 344.
[l] Ibid. p. 345.

The learned Pfaffius, in the year 1715, made some mention of Dr. Cudworth's hypothesis; first, commending it as very ingenious, and next labouring to warp it to the Lutheran notion of a real and local presence[m]. But at the same time, he took notice of some objections made to it, (mostly the same which I have above recited and answered,) and honoured them with his own approbation[n]. Besides which, he thought also of a new objection, which may here deserve considering.

The objection is, that Christ was properly a sin offering, answering to the Levitical sacrifices of that kind, which were never feasted upon; therefore the eucharistical banquet does not aptly correspond to the sacrificial feasts, which were appropriate to peace offerings, and belonged not to sin offerings[o]. But the answer to this is very short and obvious: Christ our Lord was a sin offering and a peace offering, both in one; as is plainly taught by St. Paul[p]. And if the sacrifice of Christ be considered in the Eucharist, under its most comfortable, most endearing view, as a peace offering, (not excluding the other views,) have we any reason to object against so wise and so kind an institution? To represent the sacrifice of Christ merely as a sin offering, would be representing nothing but the melancholy and dismal part of it, which had not the sweet odour, the sweet-smelling savour accompanying it. Dr. Cudworth's notion of a sacrificial feast goes upon the more delightful view, as St. Paul's also does in the text before referred to: therefore there is no more room for objecting, in this respect, against our learned author, than there is for objecting against the blessed Apostle. But I pass on.

The excellent Buddaeus (in a dissertation written in 1715, published in 1727) expresses himself with great caution and

[m] Pfaffius, Dissertat. de Obl. Vet. Eucharist. p. 199.

[n] Pfaffius, ibid. pp. 170, 171, et in Addendis.

[o] 'Nec negari tamen potest, S. Eucharistiam in eo ab epulo sacrificiali differre, quod hoc ex sacrificio pro peccato (cujus sanguis in sanctum sanctorum inferri debuit, et quale Christus fuit, 2 Cor. v. 21, Hebr. ix. 12) non confici, nec sanguis unquam bibi potuit. Levit. vi. 30. Deut. xii. 27.' Pfaff. p. 171.

[p] Ephes. v. 2. Cp. Wolfius in loc. Witsii Miscellan. Sacr. lib. ii. diss. 2. pp. 511, 512. Deylingii Observat. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 315, 316. Outram, de Sacrif. pp. 209—214.

tenderness concerning Dr. Cudworth's notion of the Lord's Supper: and all the fault he has to find with it is, that it appears not favourable to the Lutheran notion of the real presence, resolving the eucharistical supper (as he supposed) into signs only and symbols[q]. The objection runs in terms too general and indefinite: for 'real presence' is a phrase of some latitude, and capable of more senses than one. If a real participation of the fruits of Christ's passion, together with a real strengthening of the mystical union of our bodies with Christ's glorified body (however distant) may suffice, Dr. Cudworth's notion will not be found defective so far: but if the design of the objection be to plead for an oral manducation of Christ's natural body, or a local presence of it, (crucified or glorified,) that stands upon no authority of Scripture or antiquity, but was condemned long ago by our Lord himself, in his answer to the Capernaites[r].

Another very learned and ingenious Lutheran has taken particular pains to confute (if it were possible) Dr. Cudworth's True Notion, in his notes upon the Latin version, and in his preface to the same, printed A.D. 1733. His great concern is for the real and local presence: and he represents Dr. Cudworth, not only as making the elements bare symbols and figures, which is true, but as making the Lord's Supper itself nothing more than a memorial[s]; which is contrary to truth and fact, and is a manifest injury done to his very learned author. For how could Dr. Cudworth be supposed to make the Eucharist a bare memorial, when he professedly contends for a real spiritual banquet,

[q] 'Haud obscure eo tendit, ut solum pro signo atque symbolo quodam [sacra coena] habeatur, quod cum praesentia reali corporis ac sanguinis Christi consistere nequit.' Buddaeus, Observ. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 69.

[r] John vi. 63.

[s] 'Non obscure hic vir doctissimus significat, eorum sese favere partibus, qui panem et vinum, quibus frui datur illis qui ad sacram coenam accedunt, symbola tantum et imagines corporis et sanguinis Servatoris nostri esse; ipsum vero hoc convivium ritum esse eo unice institutum consilio putant, ut memoria magni sacrificii illius repetatur et renovetur, quod pro generis humani peccatis Christus in cruce supremo numini intulit.' Moshem. in Notis, p. 10; confer pp. 11, 12.

'Sapiunt haec scholam coetus illius, qui semetipsum Reformatum dici vult; cui quidem s. coena nihil est, quam adumbratio beneficiorum morte et meritis Jesu Christi humano generi partorum.... Reformati signis tantum et imaginibus sacrificii potiri suos opinantur in sacra coena.' Moshem. in Praefat.

a real feasting upon all the benefits of the grand sacrifice? Is partaking of the sacrifice nothing more than commemorating? Or is the feast ever the less real, for being spiritual and heavenly, and reaching both to soul and body; both to this world and the world to come? It is plain enough that Dr. Cudworth's notion is no way favourable to the figurists or memorialists, but much otherwise; yea more so by far than the notion or notions which are set up against it. For the certain truth is, (and why should it be any longer dissembled?) that none give so great advantage to the figurists, as those that contend for oral manducation, and make the sacramental feast common both to worthy and unworthy; and who, in order to bring that about, interpret the words of the institution, as likewise 1 Cor. x. 16, &c., so as to exclude all intimation of benefits. Which is what the figurists most of all wish for: and if that be once granted them, they desire nothing further to carry their cause.

But that I may not seem to lay a charge of this nature without sufficient grounds, let it but be considered how the last learned objector [t] to Dr. Cudworth's notion, labours to elude all Scripture proof of benefits, as drawn from 1 Cor. x. 16, only to make the sacramental feeding common both to good and bad, (as his hypothesis requires,) and so at length to resolve the Apostle's whole sense into this only, that all communicants equally receive what the Apostle there speaks of, and that the text is not to be understood of any spiritual union of good men, but of an external profession, or outward membership [u]: which, so far, is the very

[t] 'Hic monuisse satis erit, premi ab eo vestigia praecipuorum Reformati coetus doctorum, &c. . . . velle enim eos notum est, ideo coenam a Servatore nostro potissimum esse institutam, ut sancti homines, qui ad eam accedunt, cum Christo et Servatore suo arctius conjungantur, et beneficiorum hominibus ab eo partorum reddantur participes: nos vero repudiare, quia omnes homines, sive probi sint sive improbi, corporis et sanguinis Domini vere fieri compotes in sacra coena statuimus. Quae quidem eorum sententia haud patitur, ut verba sancti hominis aliter quam de spirituali conjunctione fidelium cum Christo accipiant. Mihi vero expositio haec neque verbis Pauli, neque proposito ejus videtur esse consentaneum . . . generatim et universe tradit, sacram coenam communionem esse corporis et sanguinis Christi; nec Christianorum aliquem ad sacrum hoc epulum venientium, cujuscunque demum sit indolis, ab hac communione excludit.' Moshem. in Notis, p. 30.

[u] 'Cum in sacra coena Christiani compotes fiant corporis et sanguinis Domini, testenturque, quoties sacrum illum cibum sumunt, sese inter se

same interpretation that the Socinians and other figurists warmly contend for. It is true, he supposes the Lord's natural body and blood to be really or locally present, as well as really received, (which the figurists deny,) but he supposes no spiritual benefits to be intimated in the text, because he supposes every communicant to receive all that is there spoken of, though the unworthy can receive no benefits. Thus the force of St. Paul's doctrine in that place (so far as concerns spiritual benefits) is eluded and frustrated. And when those prime texts are thus explained away, what other Scripture texts are there left sufficient to found the doctrine of spiritual benefits upon? I know there is a distinction, by the help of which good men may be presumed to receive benefits, and bad men detriment from the same things: but the question now is not whether good men may receive benefits, but whether these or any other texts positively teach that they infallibly do. If the words of institution, and those of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x., do not teach it, I must frankly profess, that I know not what other texts can be justly thought to do it without them. So that in the last result, for the sake of I know not what corporal or local presence, and oral manducation, the most important article of all, which concerns spiritual benefits, is left to shift for itself, divested of Scripture proof, and standing only on tradition, or the courtesy of the common adversaries. The Reformed churches (strictly so called) have been often, and very invidiously charged upon this head. But after all, they are the men who have formerly been, and still are, the true and faithful supporters of the doctrine of spiritual benefits in the Eucharist[x]. They maintain it in a rational, consistent way, and, as becomes them, upon a Scripture foot; grounding that doctrine chiefly on our Lord's words in the institution, and upon the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16. If they who participate of Christ's body and blood, in the sense there intended, are really ingrafted into Christ, and are vital members of him, and one with him, then indeed the doctrine of spiritual graces or benefits rests upon firm ground: but if men

conjunctos et unius sacrae civitatis membra esse.' Moshem. in Praefat. de Coena Domini, c. iii. p. 352, &c., alias p. 202, &c.; item 405, alias 230.

[x] Compare Werenfels. Dissertat.

may participate of the same, in the sense there spoken of, however unworthy, and in heart and life alienated from Christ, and without any spiritual benefits at all; then it plainly follows, that the communion of Christ's body and blood does not, in itself, imply any benefits at all, neither do those texts, nor perhaps any other, teach any such doctrine; but the doctrine must be left to stand, as it can, either upon bare presumption, or at most upon the tradition of the Church. Let but any man look into the learned writings of Chemnitius, for example, or Gerhard, to see how they prove the beneficial nature of this Sacrament; and there it will be found, that all, in a manner, resolves into this, that since Christ's body and blood is there given, all spiritual graces are by implication therewith given. Right, if as many as receive the body and blood, in St. Paul's sense of communion, receive also the graces. But that they deny: for the unworthy communicants are supposed to receive the body, without the graces. Therefore there is no certain connection, in their way, between the body and the graces: therefore the main argument of all, on which the doctrine of such graces depends, is defeated; and St. Paul's meaning in 1 Cor. x. amounts only to a commemoration of Christ's death, or an outward profession of Christ's religion, which indeed is what the learned Mosheim (as before noted) resolves it into. From hence then let the indifferent readers now judge, whether the learned Cudworth, or his learned adversary, most favours the memorialists. One admits of benefits, and can prove them by St. Paul's words, justly interpreted; the other admits them verbally, but in effect destroys them, by destroying the prime standing proofs upon which they rest.

I thought it of some moment thus previously to remove a prejudice, wrongfully thrown upon Dr. Cudworth's notion in particular, and upon the Reformed Divines in general: and now I proceed to examine what his learned antagonist has further advanced in the way of argument. He has not indeed produced any new argument beyond what I have before mentioned, and answered; but he has pitched upon two of them, as most considerable, endeavouring to reinforce them in more pompous form.

1. The first is, that Christ had not yet offered himself a sacrifice, when he instituted the Eucharist: therefore the original Eucharist was not a feast consequent upon a sacrifice: therefore the subsequent Eucharists, being undoubtedly of the same kind with the first, are not feasts upon a sacrifice [y]. I desire the reader to look back to the answer before given to the same objection, as proposed by a learned writer of our own [z]. All I shall here further add is, that many learned writers, ancient and modern, (as I shall have occasion to shew in my next chapter,) have taught, that Christ did really offer himself as a sacrifice, before his passion, and in his passion, and after; and that those three several acts may be justly looked upon as one continued oblation. If this hypothesis be admitted, the edge of the objection is blunted, or broken at once, without more ado: or if it be rejected, yet the former answer will stand in full force.

2. The second objection is, that the sacrifice of Christ corresponds to the sin offerings of old, (which had no feasts following,) and not to the peace offerings, which had [a]. This was before objected by Pfaffius, and has been answered above [b]. But I may here add, that St. Paul himself conceived that the sacrifice of Christ corresponded, some way or other, to the peace offerings, as appears by the parallel which he draws (1 Cor. x.) between the peace offerings of the law and the Eucharist under the Gospel. If St. Paul, notwithstanding that he supposed the Eucharist to be a representation, memorial, and communion of our Lord's passion, yet conceived it analogous to the peace offerings, and to the feasts thereupon; then certainly Dr. Cudworth could not be much out of the way, in maintaining the same analogy, or in conceiving that the two notions of Christ's sacrifice, and of a sacrificial banquet, are consistent with each other, and agree well together. So that it is in vain to argue against Dr. Cudworth's notion from such topics as equally affect the Apostle himself. I have before examined [c] this learned gentleman's account of St. Paul's reasoning in that chapter, and have shewn where it is defective: but be that as it will, it

[y] Moshem. in Praefat. [z] See above, p. 293. [a] Moshem. in Praefat.
[b] See above, p. 295. [c] Above, pp. 202—207.

cannot be denied that the Apostle is there speaking of the sacrificial feast among the Jews, and that he judged the Eucharist to be a feast of like kind, bearing such resemblance to them, as was sufficient to support his argument, and to make good his parallel. So much in answer to the learned Mosheim, in behalf of our learned countryman.

There is another very eminent Lutheran, who, as late as the year 1736, has given his judgment of Dr. Cudworth's notion, in terms of respect, and with his own approbation [d], as to the main of the notion; referring also to St. Paul, as affording sufficient warrant for it.

My readers will, I hope, candidly excuse the excursion here made, in order to do justice to a very great man in the first place, and next, to the Reformed Divines in general, and at the same time to a very important article of religion, which concerns the spiritual benefits conferred in the Eucharist. Upon the whole, I take leave to say, that the objections raised against the notion espoused by Dr. Cudworth appear to be rather ingenious than solid, rather industriously sought, upon foreign considerations, than naturally arising from the subject-matter, and proving at length, not that there is anything faulty in his notion, but that there are faults in those other schemes, which stand in opposition to it, or comport not with it. The favourable reception which the notion had met with amongst our own Divines all along, till very lately, and also among very considerable Divines abroad, (both Lutheran and Reformed [e],) is a great commendation of it. Dr. Pelling, in his treatise on the Sacrament, has

[d] 'A sacrificio distingui solet epulum sacrificiale, quale de oblatis olim et Pagani et Israelitae instituere solebant. . . . Et hoc ipsum epulum sacrificium interdum appellatur, &c. . . . Cum ejusmodi epulo sacrificiali S. Eucharistia non incommode comparari potest. Praeivit Apostolus 1 Cor. x. 14, et fusius id demonstravit Cudworthus in libro de Vera Notione Coenae Dominicae, Lond. 1642 et 1676. . . . Nos igitur intercedere nollemus, si adversarii [viz. pontificii] hoc sensu s. coenam sacrificium, aut epulum de sacrificio dicere vellent. Nam Servator partem quasi victimae pro nobis oblatae, videlicet corpus et sanguinem suum, in hoc epulo nobis comedendum et bibendum exhibet, cum inquit: Edite, hoc est corpus meum; Bibite, hic est sanguis meus. Sed pontificii non epulum de sacrificio, sed sacrificium verum, et proprie dictum, esse contendunt.' Deyling. Observ. Miscellan. p. 294.

[e] See several of them numbered up by Mosheim in Praefat.

made frequent use of it, and has enlarged upon it; and may properly be consulted for those parts, wherein Cudworth himself may seem to have been rather too concise and sparing of words.

The notion then being sufficiently fixed and established, we have nothing now remaining, but to pursue it in its just consequences or inferences, for the supporting the point in hand. If the Eucharist be indeed a sacrificial feast, in such a sense as hath been mentioned, it will inevitably follow, that it is also a federal banquet, carrying in it the force of a compact or stipulation between God and man. This conclusion or corollary is drawn out at large by Dr. Cudworth in a distinct chapter[f], and still more largely by other learned and judicious writers[g]; and I need not repeat. Only because some exceptions are made to the evidence brought to prove that covenants were anciently struck and ratified by feasting together, I may briefly consider those exceptions. To the instance of Isaac so covenanting with Abimelech[h], it is objected, that the covenant was subsequent to the feast[i], and therefore there was not a feast upon or after a covenant, as Dr. Cudworth's notion supposes. But then it must be observed, that Isaac and Abimelech met together in order to treat, and they settled the terms either at the feast or before it; and what was done after, was no more than executing in form the things before concluded: besides that the whole may be considered as but one continued act of covenanting along with a feast. The next instance is that of Laban's covenanting with Jacob by a feast[k]: which is permitted to pass without any objection. A third is that of the Israelites victualling, and thereby covenanting with the Gibeonites[l]: to which it is objected, as in the first instance, that the covenant was subsequent[m]. But the truth is, the feast and the covenant were one entire

[f] Cudworth, chap. vi.

[g] Pelling on the Sacrament, chap. iii. iv. Compare Abp. Potter on Church Government, p. 266. Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. tom. iii. p. 113. Dodwell, One Altar, cap. vii. p. 165. Mede's Christian Sacrifice, p. 370. Bp. Patrick's Christian Sacrifice, p. 31, &c.

[h] Gen. xxvi. 28—31.

[i] Moshem. in Notis, p. 34.

[k] Gen. xxxi. 43—55.

[l] Josh. ix. 14, 15.

[m] Moshem. ibid. p. 34.

transaction, one federal feasting, or festial covenanting. There are other the like slight exceptions made to other evidences [n]; which might be as easily replied to, were it needful: but I forbear, lest I should be tedious to the reader.

The Socinians, in general, are adversaries to this federal doctrine, as not consistent with their principles. Yet some of them unawares (such is the force of truth) have been observed to come into it, or to drop such expressions as appear tantamount. Crellius in particular (who was a great refiner of the Socinian system) scruples not to allow, that as in Circumcision formerly, so likewise in Baptism and in the Eucharist now, men bind themselves to the observance of the Divine law, as by a pledge of their obedience [o]. Which, if admitted, does of course imply a reciprocal engagement, on God's part, to confer spiritual blessings and privileges: so that this concession does in plain consequence amount to declaring both Sacraments to be federal rites [p].

Socinus, being aware that the ancient sacrifices were federal rites, and that they were as seals and pledges of a covenant between God and the people; and being aware also, that our Lord, in the institution of the Eucharist, had called the wine the blood of the covenant; was distressed for a reason, why the Eucharist should not be esteemed a federal rite, as well as those

[n] Moshem. p. 35, &c.

[o] 'Adde quod Circumcisio sit signum quoddam et tessera totius religionis Judaicae in lege praescriptae, ita ut ea suscepta, veluti pignore se homines legi obstringant, non aliter quam Baptismus in Christi nomine susceptus, vel etiam coenae Dominicae usus tessera quaedam est et symbolum Christianismi.' Crellius in Gal. v. 3.

[p] The sense of the primitive Church, with regard to the Eucharist as a covenanting rite, may be learned from the famous passage of Pliny quoted above, chap. i. p. 26. To which agrees that passage of St. Austin: 'Voventur omnia quae offeruntur Deo, maxime sancti altaris oblatio, quo sacramento praedicatur nostrum illud votum maximum, quo nos vovimus in Christo esse mansuros, utique in compage corporis Christi: cujus rei sacramentum est, quod unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus.' Aug. Epist. cxlix. p. 509. edit. Bened. It was binding themselves by solemn vow or oath to abstain from all iniquity, and to adhere to godly living. Which amounted to a renewal of their Baptismal covenant. Such a way of covenanting with God by solemn vow, or oath, is not without precedent under the Old Testament. Deut. xxix. 12. 2 Chron. xv. 14. Ezra x. 5. Nehem. x. 29. And so God also covenanted by oath with men. Isaiah lxii. 8.

sacrifices. At length he thought to account for it by saying, that to the blood of the sacrifices answers the real blood of Christ shed upon the cross, and not the wine in the Lord's Supper [q]. The force of his reasoning stands only in the equivocal meaning of the word 'answers:' for, if he meant it of the antitype answering to the type, it is true what he says, that our Lord's real blood answers, in that sense, to the blood of the sacrifices; and it answers also to the wine, the symbol of it; but if he meant it (as he ought to have meant it) of symbol answering to symbol, or of one typical service answering to another typical service, by way of analogy; then it is plain, that the wine in the Eucharist so answers to the blood of the sacrifices, being that they are representations of the same thing, and are federal by the same virtue, and under the like views, and therefore fitly answer to each other, as analogous rites.

Dr. Pelling refutes the same objection thus: 'Though we grant what Socinus affirms, that it is not the wine, but the blood of Christ, which answers to the ancient sacrifices; yet since the wine is the representation and communication of Christ's blood, we must conclude that it communicates those benefits for which that blood was shed; and consequently that it seals that covenant to every faithful communicant in particular, which the blood of Christ sealed to all mankind in general. And as it is true that our Saviour's passion did answer those sacrifices which were offered up of old; so it is true also, that this holy banquet doth answer those sacrificial feasts which were used of old [r].' The sum of all is this: the legal sacrifices were federal rites, binding legal stipulations directly, and indirectly evangelical stipulations also, shadowed out by the other: the Gospel Sacraments, which by St. Paul's account (in 1 Cor. x.) bear an analogy to those legal sacrifices, do likewise bind in a way proper to them, and as suits with the Gospel state: therefore they do directly fix and ratify evangelical stipulations. These are properly federal rites of the Gospel state, as the other were properly federal rites of the legal economy.

[q] Socin. de Usu et Fine Coenae, p. 46. alias 761.
[r] Pelling on the Lord's Supper, p. 106.

It may be asked, why verbal professions, or repeated acknowledgments, may not amount to a renewal of a covenant, as much as a Sacrament? The reason is plain: verbal professions are not the federal form prescribed; and besides, at the most, they amount only to verbal engagements, and that but on one side, and therefore express no mutual contract. They amount not to a communion of Christ's body, or a participation of his sacrifice: they are not the new covenant in Christ's blood: they are not drinking into one spirit nor pledges of our union in one body, like as the partaking of one loaf and of one cup is. In short, Sacraments are transactions of two parties, wherein God bears a share as well as man, and where the visible signs have an inseparable conjunction with the invisible graces signified, when duly administered to persons worthy. Verbal professions, singly considered, come far short of what has been mentioned, and therefore cannot be presumed to amount to a renewal of a covenant, like the other.

It may be pleaded perhaps, that repentance is the best renewal of our covenant, and is more properly so than any Sacrament can be. But, on the other hand, it is certain, that repentance is rather a qualification, on our part, for renewing, than a form or rite of renewal; and it expresses only what man does, not what God does at the same time; and therefore it amounts not to mutual contract. The terms of a covenant ought to be distinguished from acts of covenanting, and the things stipulated from the stipulation itself, or from the federal forms. To be short, repentance is properly the renewal of the man; but the renewal of a covenant is quite another thing, and must include the reciprocal acts of both parties. It is very wrong to argue, that any act or performance of one party only can be federal, like a Sacrament which takes in both, and includes both part and counterpart. But the aim seems to be, to throw God's part out of the Sacraments, and then indeed they would not be federal rites, no, nor Sacraments, in any just sense.

I know of no material objection further, so far as concerns the present article, and so I proceed to a new chapter.

CHAP. XII.

The Service of the EUCHARIST *considered in a Sacrificial View.*

THAT the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in whole or in part, in a sense proper or improper, is a sacrifice of the Christian Church, is a point agreed upon among all knowing and sober divines, Popish, Lutheran, or Reformed. But the Romanists have so often and so grievously abused the once innocent names of oblation, sacrifice, propitiation, &c., perverting them to an ill sense, and grafting false doctrine and false worship upon them, that the Protestants have been justly jealous of admitting those names, or scrupulously wary and reserved in the use of them.

The general way, among both Lutheran and Reformed, has been to reject any proper propitiation, or proper sacrifice in the Eucharist; admitting however of some kind of propitiation in a qualified sense, and of sacrifice also, but of a spiritual kind, and therefore styled improper, or metaphorical. Nevertheless Mr. Mede, a very learned and judicious Divine and Protestant, scrupled not to assert a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist, (as he termed it,) a material sacrifice, the sacrifice of bread and wine, analogous to the mincha of the old Law [s]. This doctrine he delivered in the college chapel, A.D. 1635, which was afterwards published with improvements, under the title of The Christian Sacrifice. In the year 1642, the no less learned Dr. Cudworth printed his well-known treatise on the same subject; wherein he as plainly denies any proper or any material sacrifice in the Eucharist [t]; but admits of a symbolical feast upon a sacrifice [u], that is to say, upon the grand sacrifice itself commemorated under certain symbols. This appears to have been the prevailing doctrine of our Divines, both before and since. There can be no doubt of the current doctrine down to Mr. Mede: and as to what has most prevailed since, I need only refer to three very eminent Divines, who wrote in the years 1685, 1686, 1688 [x].

[s] See Mede's Works, p. 355. ed. 3. A.D. 1672.

[t] Cudworth's True Notion of the Lord's Supper, chap. v. p. 77.

[u] Cudworth, ibid. pp. 21, 78.

[x] Dr. Pelling on the Sacrament, pp. 41—47. Dr. Sharpe, (afterwards Archbishop,) vol. vii. Serm. 2. Dr.

In the year 1702, the very pious and learned Dr. Grabe published his Irenaeus, and in his notes upon the author fell in with the sentiments of Mr. Mede, so far as concerns a proper and material sacrifice in the Eucharist[y]: and after him, our incomparably learned and judicious Bishop Bull, in an English treatise, gave great countenance to the same[z].

Dr. Grabe's declaring for a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist, and at the same time censuring both Luther and Calvin, by name, for rejecting it, gave great alarm to the learned Protestants abroad, and excited several of them to re-examine the question about the eucharistical sacrifice.

The first who appeared was the excellent Buddaeus[a], (A.D. 1705,) a Lutheran Divine of established character for learning, temper, and judgment; though he happened to betray some precipitancy in this matter: he appeared much concerned at what Dr. Grabe had written on this argument, but misapprehended him all the time, as was natural for him to do: for, imagining that Dr. Grabe had maintained a real presence in the Lutheran sense, and a proper sacrifice besides, the consequence was self-evident, that such a presence and sacrifice together could resolve into nothing else but the sacrifice of the mass. Therefore he treats Dr. Grabe all the way, as one that had asserted the popish sacrifice: and what confirmed him in the injurious suspicion was, that some of the Jesuits[b] (whether ignorantly or artfully) had boasted of Dr. Grabe as a declared man on their side, against both Luther and Calvin. However, Buddaeus's dissertation on the subject is a well-penned performance, and may be of good service to every careful reader, for the light it gives into the main question.

In the year 1706, a very learned Calvinist[c] occasionally engaged in the same question about the sacrifice: not with any

Payne's Disc. of the Sacrifice of the Mass, pp. 42—54.

[y] Grabe in Iren. lib. iv. cap. 32. p. 323. edit. Oxon.

[z] Bishop Bull's Answer to the Bishop of Meaux. pp. 18, 19.

[a] Buddaeus de Origine Missae Pontificiae, Miscell. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 3—63.

[b] Mémoires pour l'Histoire des Sciences. &c. A.D. 1703.

[c] Sam. Basnage, Annal. tom. i. pp. 370—374.

view to Dr. Grabe, (so far as appears,) but in opposition only to the Romanists. However, I thought it proper just to make mention of him here, as falling within the same time, and being a great master of ecclesiastical antiquity.

Some time after, (A.D. 1709,) Ittigius, a learned Lutheran, took occasion to pass some strictures upon Dr. Grabe in that article[d]: then Deylingius[e] and Zornius[f], learned Lutherans, and all still pursuing the same mistake which Buddaeus had fallen into.

But in the year 1715, the acute and candid Pfaffius (a Lutheran also) took care to do justice to Dr. Grabe's sentiments, (though not altogether approving them,) being so fair as to own, that Dr. Grabe's notion of the eucharistical sacrifice was nothing akin to the sacrifice of the mass[g]. Nevertheless others still went on in the first mistake: and among the rest, the celebrated Le Clerc[h], and a greater man than he, Campegius Vitringa[i]; and another fine writer[k], later than both; all of them condemning the doctrine, wrongfully, as popish. But it may be proper here to take notice, that the learned Deylingius, who had formerly charged Dr. Grabe too hastily, has, upon better information, retracted that censure, in a book lately published[l]: and the complaint now is, not that Dr. Grabe asserted the sacrifice of the mass, (which he heartily abhorred,) but that he rejected the real, local, or corporal presence[m], such as the Papists or Lutherans contend for: in which most certainly he judged right.

But before I close this brief historical view of that controversy, it may not be improper to observe how far the learned Pfaffius was inclinable to concur with Dr. Grabe in this article. He allows that the ancients, by oblation and sacrifice, meant more than prayer, and that it is even ludicrous to pretend the

[d] Ittigius, Histor. Eccles. primi Saec. p. 204.

[e] Deylingius, Observ. Sacr. tom. i. n. 54. p. 262.

[f] Zornius, Opuscul. Sacr. tom. i. p. 732.

[g] Pfaffius, Irenaei Fragm. Anecdot. p. 106 &c., 499.

[h] Clerici Histor. Eccl. p. 772.

[i] Vitringa in Isa. tom. ii. p. 951.

[k] Moshem. A D. 1733. in Praefat. ad Cudworth de Coena.

[l] Deylingius, Observat. Miscell. p. 103. A.D. 1736.

[m] Vid. Deylingius, ibid. p. 77.

contrary [n]. He acknowledges that they speak of an oblation of bread and wine [o], and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice of praise [p], and propitiatory also in a qualified sober sense [q]. In short, he seems almost to yield up everything that Dr. Grabe had contended for, excepting only the point of a proper or material sacrifice: and he looked upon that as resolving at length into a kind of logomachy, a difference in words or names, arising chiefly from the difficulty of determining what a sacrifice properly means, and from the almost insuperable perplexities among learned men, about the ascertaining any precise definition of it [r]. I am persuaded there is a good deal of truth in what that learned gentleman has said, and that a great part of the debate, so warmly carried on a few years ago, was more about names than things.

As the question arises chiefly out of what was taught by the ancient Fathers, it will be proper to inquire what they really meant by the word sacrifice, and in what sense they applied that name to the Eucharist, in whole or in part. St. Austin, who well understood both what the Scripture and the Christian writers before him had taught, defines or describes a true sacrifice, in the general, as follows: 'A true sacrifice is any work done to keep up our league of amity with God, referred to him as our sovereign good, in whom we may enjoy true felicity [s].' I follow his sense, rather than the strict letter, to make it the clearer to an English reader. St. Austin here judged it necessary for every such good work to be performed with a view to God, to be referred to his glory; otherwise it could not with any propriety be called a sacrifice to him: therefore even works of mercy done to man, out of compassion, tenderness, or humanity, though true sacrifices if considered as done with a view to God, would be no sacrifice at all, if they wanted that circumstance to recommend them [t]. From hence we may see

[n] Pfaffius, Irenaei Fragm. Anecdot. p. 50.

[o] Ibid. pp. 254—274, 314, 344.

[p] Ibid. pp. 330, 338.

[q] Ibid. pp. 211, 229.

[r] Ibid. in Praefat. et pp. 344, 345.

[s] 'Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaereamus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni, quo veraciter beati esse possimus.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242.

[t] 'Misericordia verum sacrificium est.... Ipsa misericordia qua homini subvenitur, si propter Deum non fit,

what that Father's general notion of a true sacrifice was. He takes notice further, that what had been commonly called sacrifice, is really nothing more than an outward sign, token, or symbol of true sacrifice [u]. The distinction here made may afford great light as to the meaning of the ancients, where they denominate the Eucharist a sacrifice, or a true and perfect sacrifice. They meant, for the most part, that it was true and evangelical service, as opposed to legal: in that sense, the eucharistical service was itself true sacrifice, and properly our sacrifice. And if, over and above, the elements themselves, unconsecrated, were ever called a sacrifice, or sacrifices, the meaning still was, that the service was the sacrifice: but when the consecrated elements had that name, it was only a metonymy of the sign for the thing signified, as they represent, and in effect exhibit, the grand sacrifice of the cross.

It is worth observing, that in Scripture style, whatever exhibits any advantage or blessing in larger measure, or in a more eminent degree, is denominated true, in opposition to other things which only appear to do the like, or do it but defectively [x]. In such a sense as that, the Gospel services are the true sacrifices, called also under the Law sacrifices of righteousness [y]. I know not how it comes to pass, that moderns generally have reckoned all the spiritual sacrifices among the nominal, improper, metaphorical sacrifices; whereas the ancients judged them to be the truest sacrifices of any, yea, and infinitley more excellent than the other. If it be said, that external, material,

non est sacrificium. . . . Sacrificium res divina est,' &c. Augustin. ibid.

[u] 'Illud quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificii.' Augustin. ibid. 'Nec quod ab antiquis patribus talia sacrificia facta sunt in victimis pecorum (quod nunc Dei populus legit, non facit) aliud intelligendum est, nisi rebus illis eas res fuisse significatas quae aguntur in nobis, in hoc ut adhaereamus Deo, et ad eundem finem proximo consulamus. Sacrificium ergo visibile, invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est.' Ibid. cap. 5.

[x] See John i. 4, 9, 17; iv. 23, 24; vi. 32; xv. 1. Luke xvi. 11. Heb. viii. 2; ix. 11, 24.

[y] 'Vera sacrificia sunt ejusmodi sacrificia, quae vere id habent quod caetera habere videntur. Dicuntur illa, eodem loquendi modo, sacrificia justitiae, id est *θυσίαι ἀληθιναὶ*, sacrificia vera. Intelligitur autem hac phrasi totus cultus Novi Testamenti.' Vitringa de vet. Synag. p. 65. Cp. ejusd. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 499, et in Isa. tom. ii. pp. 56, 733, 829.

symbolical sacrifices had all along engrossed the name of sacrifices, and therefore were the only sacrifices properly so called, as the custom of language is the rule of propriety; it may be replied, on the other hand, that spiritual sacrifices really carry in them all that the other signify or point to, and so, upon the general reason of all sacrifice, have a just, or a more eminent title to that name: and this may be thought as good a rule of propriety, as the custom of language can be. Suppose, for instance, that sacrifice, in its general nature, means the making a present to the Divine Majesty, as Plato defines it[z]; is not the presenting him with our prayers, praises, and good works, as properly making him a present, as the other? Therefore if the general reason or definition of sacrifice suits as properly (yea, and eminently) with spiritual sacrifices as with any other, I see not why they should not be esteemed proper sacrifices, as well as the other. However, since this would amount only to a strife about words, it is of no great moment, whether spiritual sacrifices be called proper or improper sacrifices, so long as they are allowed to be true and excellent, and as much to be preferred before the other, as substance before shadow, and truth before sign or figure. The ancients, I think, looked upon the spiritual sacrifices as true and proper sacrifices, and are so to be understood, whenever they apply the name of sacrifice to the service of the Eucharist. But to make it a material sacrifice would, in their account, have been degrading and vilifying it, reducing it to a legal ceremony, instead of a Gospel service.

The service therefore of the Eucharist, on the foot of ancient Church language, is both a true and a proper sacrifice, (as I shall shew presently,) and the noblest that we are capable of offering, when considered as comprehending under it many true and evangelical sacrifices: 1. The sacrifice of alms to the poor, and oblations to the Church; which when religiously intended, and offered through Christ, is a Gospel sacrifice[a]. Not that the material offering is a sacrifice to God, for it goes entirely to the

[z] Οὐκοῦν τὸ θύειν, δωρεῖσθαί ἐστι τοῖς θεοῖς. Plato, Euthyphron. p. 10.

[a] Philippians iv. 18. Hebrews xiii. 16. Compare Acts x. 4. Ecclus. xxxv. 2.

use of man; but the service is what God accepts. 2. The sacrifice of prayer, from a pure heart, is evangelical incense [b]. 3. The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God the Father, through Christ Jesus our Lord, is another Gospel sacrifice [c]. 4. The sacrifice of a penitent and contrite heart, even under the Law, (and now much more under the Gospel, when explicitly offered through Christ,) was a sacrifice of the new covenant [d]: for the new covenant commenced from the time of the fall, and obtained under the Law, but couched under shadows and figures. 5. The sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, is another Gospel sacrifice [e]. 6. The offering up the mystical body of Christ, that is, his Church, is another Gospel sacrifice [f]: or rather, it is coincident with the former; excepting that there persons are considered in their single capacity, and here collectively in a body. I take the thought from St. Austin [g], who grounds it chiefly on 1 Cor. x. 17, and the texts belonging to the former article. 7. The offering up of true converts, or sincere penitents, to God, by their pastors, who have laboured successfully in the blessed work, is another very acceptable Gospel sacrifice [h]. 8. The sacrifice of faith and hope, and self-humiliation, in commemorating the grand sacrifice, and resting finally upon it, is another Gospel sacrifice [i], and eminently proper to the Eucharist.

These, I think, are all so many true sacrifices, and may all meet together in the one great complicated sacrifice of the Eucharist. Into some one or more of these may be resolved (as I conceive) all that the ancients have ever taught of Christian sacrifices, or of the Eucharist under the name or notion of a true or proper sacrifice. Let it be supposed however for the present,

[b] Revel. v. 8; viii. 3, 4. Compare Psalm cxli. 2. Malach. i. 11; iii. 4. 5. Hos. xiv. 2. Acts x. 4. Ecclus. xxxv. 2.

[c] Heb. xiii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Compare Psalm l. 14, 15; lxix. 31; cxvi. 17.

[d] Psalm iv. 5; li. 17. Isa. i. 16; lvii. 15.

[e] Rom. xii. 1. Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6.

[f] 1 Cor. x. 17.

[g] Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. vi. p. 243; cap. xx. p. 256. Epist. lix. alias cxlix. p. 509. edit. Bened.

[h] Rom. xv. 16. Phil. ii. 17. Compare Isa. lxvi. 20, cum Notis Vitring. p. 950.

[i] This is not said in any single text, but may be clearly collected from many compared.

in order to give the reader the clearer idea beforehand of what I intend presently to prove. In the meanwhile, supposing this account to be just, from hence may easily be understood how far the Eucharist is a commemorative sacrifice, or otherwise. If that phrase means a spiritual service of ours, commemorating the sacrifice of the cross, then it is justly styled a sacrifice commemorative of a sacrifice, and in that sense a commemorative sacrifice: but if that phrase points only to the outward elements representing the sacrifice made by Christ, then it means a sacrifice commemorated, or a representation and commemoration of a sacrifice [k].

From hence likewise may we understand in what sense the officiating authorized ministers perform the office of proper evangelical priests in this service. They do it three ways: 1. As commemorating, in solemn form, the same sacrifice here below, which Christ our High Priest commemorates above. 2. As handing up (if I may so speak) those prayers and those services of Christians to Christ our Lord, who as High Priest recommends the same in heaven to God the Father [l]. 3. As offering up to God all the faithful who are under their care and ministry, and who are sanctified by the Spirit [m]. In these three ways the Christian officers are priests, or *liturgs*, to very excellent purposes, far above the legal ones, in a sense worth the contending for, and worth the pursuing with the utmost zeal and assiduity.

Having thus far intimated beforehand what I apprehend to be in the main, or in the general, a just account of the eucharistical sacrifice, upon the principles laid down in Scripture, as

[k] 'Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? Et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes paschae solennitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec utique mentitur qui, interrogatus, eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent: ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo, secundum quendam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita sacramentum fidei fides est.' Augustin. Epist. ad Bonifacium, xcviii. alias xxiii. p. 267. ed. Bened.

[l] Revel. viii. 4. Vid. Vitring. in loc.

[m] Rom. xv. 16.

interpreted by the ancients: I shall next proceed to examine the ancients one by one, in order to see whether this account tallies with what they have said upon this article.

I shall begin with St. Barnabas, supposed, with some probability, to have been the author of the Epistle bearing his name, penned about A.D. 71. This very early writer, taking notice of the difference between the Law and the Gospel, observes that Christ had abolished the legal sacrifices, to make way for an human oblation[o]: which he explains soon after, by an humble and contrite heart, referring to Psalm li. 17. So by human oblation, he means the free-will offering of the heart, as opposed to the yoke of legal observances; the offering up the whole inner man, instead of the outward superficial performances of the Law. Therefore the Christian sacrifice, as here described by our author, resolves into the 5th article of the account which I have given above. Mr. Dodwell renders the words of Barnabas thus: 'These things therefore he has evacuated, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without any yoke of bondage, might bring in the mystical oblation[p].' He conceived the original Greek words (which are lost) might have been λογικὴ λατρεία, reasonable service: which however is merely conjecture. But he understood the place of Christians offering themselves, their souls and bodies, instead of sacrificing beasts. Another learned man, who had an hypothesis to serve, understands by human oblation, an offering made with freedom; and he interprets it of the voluntary oblations made by communicants at the altar, viz. the lay oblations[q]. The interpretation appears somewhat forced, and agrees not well with Barnabas's own explication superadded, concerning an humble and contrite heart; unless we take in both: however, even upon that supposition, the Christian sacrifice here pointed to will be a spiritual sacrifice, or service, the sacrifice of charitable benevolence, and will fall under article

[o] 'Haec ergo [sacrificia] vacua fecit, ut nova lex Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae sine jugo necessitatis est, humanam habeat oblationem . . . nobis enim dicit, Sacrificium Deo, cor tribulatum, et humiliatum Deus non despicit.' Barnab. Epist. cap. ii. p. 57.

[p] Dodwell of Incensing, p. 33, &c.

[q] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 333, alias 338.

the first, above mentioned. There have not been wanting some who would wrest the passage so far as to make it favour the sacrifice of the mass: but the learned Pfaffius[r] has abundantly confuted every pretence that way, and has also well defended the common construction; which Menardus had before admitted, and which Dodwell also came into, and which I have here recommended. There is nothing more in Barnabas that relates at all to our purpose, and so we may pass on to other Christian writers in order.

Clemens of Rome has been cited in a chapter above[s], as speaking of the lay oblations brought to the altar, and of the sacerdotal oblation afterwards made of the same gifts, previously to the consecration. No doubt but such lay offerings amounted to spiritual sacrifice, being acceptable service under the Gospel; and they fall under article the first, in the enumeration before given. I cannot repeat too often, that in such cases the service, the good work, the duty performed is properly the sacrifice, according to the definition of sacrifice in St. Austin[t] above cited, and according to plain good sense. When Cornelius's prayers and alms ascended up for a memorial, (a name alluding to the legal incense,) it was not his money, nor any material gifts, that ascended, or made the memorial; but it was the piety, the mercy, the beneficence, the virtues of the man. Under the Gospel, God receives no material thing at all, to be consumed and spent in his own immediate service, and for his honour only: he receives no blood, no libation, no incense, no burnt offerings, no perfumes, as before. If he receives alms and oblations, (as in the Eucharistical service,) he receives them not as gifts to himself, to be consumed in his immediate service, but as gifts to be consecrated for the use of man, to whom they go. All that is material is laid out upon man only; not upon God, as in the Jewish economy. But God receives, now under the Gospel, our religious

[r] Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. sect. xxii. p. 239, &c.

[s] See above, chap. i. p. 22.

[t] Omne opus, &c. every good work. And it is observable that, conformably to such definition, that Father makes Baptism a sacrifice: 'Holocausto Dominicae passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine Baptizatus imbuitur.' Augustin. ad Roman. Expos. cap. xix. col. 937. tom. iii.

services, our good works, our virtuous exercises, in the name of Christ, and these are our truly Christian and spiritual sacrifices. In this view, the lay oblations, which Clemens refers to, were Christian sacrifices. So also were the sacerdotal services, referred to by the same Clemens; though in a view somewhat different, and falling under a distinct branch of Gospel sacrifice, reducible to article the seventh in the foregoing recital. Those who endeavour to construe Clemens's προσφοραὶ and λειτουργίαι (oblations and sacerdotal ministrations) as favouring the sacrifice of the mass, run altogether wide of the truth; as is plain from one single reason among many [u], that all which Clemens speaks of was previous to the consecration. Those also who plead from thence for material oblations, as acceptable under the Gospel, mistake the case: for the material part (as before hinted) goes not to God, is not considered purely as a gift to him, (like the burnt offerings or incense under the Law, consumed in his immediate service,) but as a gift for the use of man; and so nothing remains for God to accept of, as given to him, but the spiritual service; and even that he accepts not of, unless it really answers its name. So that it is plain that the New Testament admits of none but spiritual sacrifices; because none else are now properly given to God, or accepted by him as so given.

Justin Martyr, of the second century, is so clear and so express upon the subject of Gospel sacrifice, that one need not desire any fuller light than he will furnish us with. The sum of his doctrine is, that prayers and praises, and universal obedience, are the only Christian sacrifices: from whence it most evidently follows, that whenever he gives the name of oblation, or sacrifice, to the Eucharist, his whole meaning is, that it is a religious service comprehending prayers, praises, &c., and therefore has a just title to the name of Christian oblation and sacrifice. But let us examine the passages.

He writes thus: 'We have been taught, that God has no need of any material oblation from men; well knowing, that he is the

[u] The reader may see that whole question discussed at large in Buddaeus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 45—49. Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Euch. pp. 254—269.

giver of all things: but we are informed, and persuaded, and do believe, that he accepts those only who copy after his moral perfections, purity, righteousness, philanthropy [x],' &c. Here we may observe, that God accepts not, according to our author, any material oblation at all, considered as a gift to him, nor anything but what is spiritual, as all religious services, and all virtuous exercises really are: those are the Gospel oblations according to Justin, here and everywhere. A few pages after, he takes notice, 'that God has no need of blood, libations, or incense, but that the Christian manner was, to offer him prayers and thanksgivings for all the blessings they enjoy, to the utmost of their power: that the only way of paying him honour suitable, was not to consume by fire what he had given for our sustenance, but to spend it upon ourselves, and upon the poor, and to render him the tribute of our grateful hymns and praises [y],' &c.

Here we may note how exactly he points out the difference between other sacrifices (Pagan or Jewish) and the sacrifices of the Gospel. In those there was something spent, as it were, immediately upon God, entirely lost, wasted, consumed, because considered as a gift to God only; which is the proper notion of a material sacrifice: but in these, nothing is entirely spent, or consumed, but all goes to the use of man; only the praise, the glory, the tribute of homage and service, that is given to God, and that he accepts, as a proper sacrifice, and as most suitable to his Divine Majesty. Not that he needs even these, or can be benefited by them: but he takes delight in the exercise of his own philanthropy, which has so much the larger field to move in, according as his creatures render themselves fit objects of it by acts of religion and virtue. But I proceed with our author.

[x] 'Αλλ' οὐ δέεσθαι τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προσειλήφαμεν τὸν Θεὸν, αὐτὸν παρέχοντα πάντα ὁρῶντες· ἐκείνους δὲ προσδέχεσθαι αὐτὸν μόνον δεδιδάγμεθα, καὶ πεπείσμεθα, καὶ πιστεύομεν, τοὺς τὰ προσόντα αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ μιμουμένους, σωφροσύνην, καὶ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ ὅσα οἰκεῖα Θεῷ ἐστι. Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 14. edit. Lond.

[y] 'Ανενδεῆ αἱμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν καὶ θυμιαμάτων . . . λέγοντες, λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πᾶσιν ὅση δύναμις αἰνοῦντες· μόνην ἀξίαν αὐτοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην παραλαβόντες, τὸ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διατροφὴν γινόμενα, οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν. κ.τ.λ. Just. Mart. ibid. p. 19.

In another place he expressly teaches, that 'prayers and thanksgivings, made by them that are worthy, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices;' adding, that 'those only are offered in the eucharistical commemoration [z].' It is observable, that by the restriction to the worthy, he supposes a good life to go along with prayers and praises to make them acceptable sacrifice, conformably to what he had before taught, as above recited. Indeed, prayers and praises are most directly, immediately, emphatically sacrifice, as a tribute offered to God only: which is the reason why Justin and other Fathers speak of them in the first place, as the proper or primary sacrifices of Christians. Obedience is sacrifice also, as it respects God; but it may have another aspect towards ourselves, or other men, and therefore is not so directly a sacrifice to God alone. This distinction is well illustrated by a judicious Divine of our own [a], whose words I may here borrow: 'The sacrifice of obedience is metaphorical: that is, God accepts it as well as if it had been a sacrifice; that is, something given to himself: but the sacrifice of praise is proper, without a metaphor [b]. The nature of it accomplished by offering something to God, in acknowledgment of him.... The honour which God receives from our obedience, differs from that of a sacrifice; for that is only of consequence, and by argumentation: that is, it suits with the nature and will of God; as we say, good servants are an honour to their masters, by reflection. But the honour by sacrifice is of direct and special intendment: it hath no other use, and is a distinct virtue from all other acts of obedience, and of a different obligation..... Though God hath the honour of

[z] "Οτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς. Justin. Dial. p. 387.

[a] Bishop Lany's Sermon on Heb. xiii. 15. pp. 30—32.

[b] Note, this very acute and knowing Divine had not learned to call every spiritual sacrifice a metaphorical sacrifice: for he admits of prayers and praises, and the like religious services, as true and proper sacrifices. I conceive further, that even obedience, formally considered as respecting God, and as a tribute offered to him, (though it has other views besides, in which it is no sacrifice at all,) is as properly sacrifice as the other: and so judged St. Austin above cited.

obedience and a virtuous life; if we deny him the honour of a sacrifice besides, we rob him of his due, and a greater sacrilege we cannot commit.... This is robbing God of the service itself, to which the other, dedicated for his service, are but accessary.' Thus far Bishop Lany to the point in hand. I return to Justin Martyr.

We have seen how uniform and constant this early Christian writer was, with respect to the general doctrine concerning Gospel sacrifices, as being spiritual sacrifices, and no other. Nothing more remains, but to consider how to reconcile that general doctrine with the particular doctrine taught by the same writer concerning the Eucharist, as a sacrifice. He makes mention of the legal offering of fine flour, or meal offering, as a type of the bread of the Eucharist[c]: and a little after, citing a noted place of the Prophet Malachi, he interprets the pure offering, the mincha, or bread-offering there predicted, of the bread eucharistical, and likewise of wine[d], denominating them, as it seems, the sacrifices offered by us Gentile Christians. Does not all this look very like the admitting of material sacrifices under the Gospel? And how then could he consistently elsewhere exclude all material oblations, and admit none but spiritual sacrifices as belonging to the Christian state? Mr. Pfaffius, being aware of the appearing difficulty, cuts the knot, instead of untying it, and charges the author with saying and unsaying[e]: which perhaps was not respectful enough towards his author, nor prudent for his own cause, unless the case had been desperate, which he had no reason to suspect, so far as I apprehend. He undertakes afterwards to sum up Justin's sentiments on this head, and does it in a manner somewhat perplexed, to this effect: 'That the New Testament admits of no sacrifices but prayers, praises, and thanksgivings: but however, if it does admit of anything corresponding, or similar to the legal oblations, it is that of the oblation of bread and wine in the

[c] Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 220.

[d] *Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας προλέγει τότε.* Justin. ibid.

[e] Pfaffius de Oblat. vet. Eucharist. pp. 270, 272.

Eucharist [f].' This is leaving the readers much in the dark, and his author to shift for sense and consistency. At the best, it is dismissing the evidence as doubtful, not determinate enough to give reasonable satisfaction.

Mr. Dodwell's account of Justin in this article is no clearer than the former. He takes notice, that his Father 'allows no other sacrifice but that of prayer and Eucharist;' he should have said, thanksgiving: and soon after he adds in the same page; 'elsewhere he owns no acceptable sacrifice under the Gospel, but the Eucharist; in opposition to the Jewish sacrifices, which were consumed by fire, and which were confined to Jerusalem [g].' Still, here is no account given how Justin could reject all material sacrifice, and yet consistently admit of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, if that be a material and not a spiritual oblation. The most that Mr. Dodwell's solution can amount to is, that Justin did not absolutely reject material sacrifices, provided they were not to be consumed by fire, or provided (as he hints in another work [h]) that they are but purely eucharistical. But this solution will never account for Justin's so expressly and fully excluding all material oblations, and so particularly restraining the notion of Gospel sacrifices to prayers, praises, and good works.

Some learned men think that a material sacrifice may yet be called a rational and spiritual sacrifice [i]: and therefore, though the Fathers do expressly reject material sacrifices, they mean only sacrifices of a certain kind; and though they admit none but spiritual sacrifices, they might yet tacitly except such material sacrifices as are spiritual also. But this appears to be a very harsh solution, and such as would go near to confound all language. However, most certainly, it ought never to be admitted, if any clearer or juster solution can be thought on, as I am persuaded there may.

[f] 'Ita nempe secum statuit vir sanctus, nulla esse in Novo Testamento sacrificia, quam laudes, gratiarum actiones, et preces; si quid tamen sit quod cum oblationibus Veteris Testamenti conferri queat, esse panem vinumque Eucharistiae, quae altari, seu mensae sacrae imposita, precibusque juxta mandatum Christi Deo oblata, in Sacramentum corporis sanguinisque Dominici consecrentur.' Pfaffius, ibid. p. 274.

[g] Dodwell of Incensing, p. 46.

[h] Dodwell's One Altar, pp. 203, 204.

[i] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 18, &c.

Justin's principles, if rightly considered, hang well together, and are all of a piece. He rejects all material sacrifices absolutely: and though the Eucharist be a sacrifice, according to him, yet it is not the matter of it, viz. the bread and wine, that is properly the sacrifice, but it is the service only, and that is a spiritual sacrifice. Alms are a Gospel sacrifice, according to St. Paul: not the material alms, but the exercise of charity, that is the sacrifice. In like manner, the Eucharist is a Gospel sacrifice. Not the material symbols, but the service, consisting of a prayer, praise, contrite hearts, self-humiliation, &c. Well, but may not the like be said of all the legal sacrifices, that there also the service was distinct from the matter, and so those also were spiritual sacrifices? No: the circumstances were widely different. In the legal sacrifices, either the whole or some part of the offering was directly given to God [k], and either consumed by fire, or poured forth, never returning to the use of man: and thereupon was founded the gross notion, of which God by his Prophets more than once complains[l], as if the Deity had need of such things, or took delight in them. But now, under the Gospel, nothing is so given to God, nothing consumed in his immediate service: we present his gifts and his creatures before him, and we take them back again for the use of ourselves and of our brethren. All that we really give up to God as his tribute, are our thanks, our praises, our acknowledgments, our homage, our selves, our souls and bodies; which is all spiritual sacrifice, purely spiritual: and herein lies the main difference between the Law and the Gospel [m]. We have no material sacrifices at all. The matter of the Eucharist is sacramental, and the bread and wine are signs: yea, signs of a sacrifice, that is of

[k] Some have thought the paschal sacrifice to make an exception, because it was all to be eaten. But it is certain that one part, viz. the blood, was to be poured forth, and sprinkled, 2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11, yea and offered unto God, Exod. xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25, as belonging of right to him: and those who are best skilled in Jewish antiquities, think that the inwards, or fat, was to be burnt upon the altar. See Reland, Antiq. Hebr. p. 383. Deylingius, Observ. Sacr. tom. iii. p. 332. Cudworth on the Lord's Supper, p. 3. fol. ed.

[l] Psalm l. 12, 13. Isaiah i. 11. Mic. vi. 6, 7.

[m] See Mr. Lewis's Answer to Unbloody Sacrifice, pp. 2, 5, 11.

the sacrifice of the cross: but as to any sacrifice of ours, it lies entirely in the service we perform, and in the qualifications or dispositions which we bring, which are all so much spiritual oblation, or spiritual sacrifice, and nothing else.

From hence may be perceived how consistent and uniform this early Father was in his whole doctrine on that head. He expressed himself very accurately, when, speaking of spiritual and perfect sacrifices, he said, that they were what Christians offered over, or upon the eucharistical commemoration[n]: that is, they spiritually sacrificed in the service of the Eucharist. They did not make the material elements their sacrifice, but the signs only of a greater. Their service they offered up to God as his tribute; but the elements they took entirely to themselves. When he speaks of the sacrifices of bread and wine[o], he may reasonably be understood to mean, the spiritual sacrifices of lauds, or of charity, which went along with the solemn feasting upon the bread and wine; and not that the elements themselves were sacrifices[p]. Upon the whole therefore, I take this blessed martyr to have been consistent throughout in his doctrine of spiritual sacrifices, as being the only sacrifices prescribed, or allowed by the Gospel. And if he judged the Eucharist to be (as indeed he did) a most acceptable sacrifice, it was because he supposed it to comprise many sacrifices in one; a right faith, and clean heart, and devout affections, breaking forth in fervent prayers, praises, and thanksgivings unto God, and charitable contributions to the brethren.

[n] Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς. Dial. p. 387.

Θυσίας . . . ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου . . . γινομένας. Dial. p. 386

[o] Προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Dial. p. 220.

[p] It may be suggested (see Johnson, part i. p. 271) that the word ἀνάμνησις, memorial, was used in relation to the show-bread, Levit. xxiv. 7, a type of the Eucharist. But it is observable, that the show-bread was not the memorial; but the incense burnt upon it, that was the memorial, as the text expressly says. Now it is well known, that prayers, lauds, &c. are the evangelical incense, succeeding in the room of the legal: therefore, to make everything correspond, the spiritual services of the Eucharist are properly our memorial, our incense, and not the material elements.

Athenagoras may come next, who has not much to our purpose: but yet something he has. He observes, that 'God needs no blood, nor fat, nor sweet scents of flowers, nor incense, being himself the most delightful perfume: but the noblest sacrifice in his sight, is to understand his works and ways, and to lift up holy hands to him[q].' A little after he adds, 'What should I do with burnt offerings, which God has no need of? But it is meet to offer him an unbloody sacrifice, and to bring him a rational service[r].' Here we see what the proper Christian sacrifices are, namely, the spiritual sacrifices of devout prayers, and obedience of heart and life. The service is, with this writer, the sacrifice. He takes notice of God's not needing burnt offerings, and the like. All material sacrifices considered as gifts to God, were apt to insinuate some such idea to weak minds: but the spiritual services do not. In our eucharistical solemnity we consider not the elements, when presented before God, as properly our gifts to him, but as his gifts to us[s]; which, we pray, may be consecrated to our spiritual uses. We pay our acknowledgments for them at the same time: and that makes one part, the smallest part, of our spiritual sacrifice, or service, in that solemnity. It may be worth noting, that here in Athenagoras we find the first mention of unbloody sacrifice, which he makes equivalent to reasonable service: and he applies it not particularly to the Eucharist, but to spiritual sacrifices at large. An argument, that when it came afterwards to be applied to the Eucharist, it still carried the same meaning, and was chosen with a view to the spiritual services contained in it, and not to the material oblation, or oblations, considered as such.

Irenaeus, of the same time, will afford us still greater light, with regard to the point in hand. He is very large and diffuse

[q] *Θυσία αὐτῷ μεγίστη, ἂν γινώσκωμεν τὶς ἐξέτεινε, κ.τ.λ., καὶ ἐπαίρωμεν ὁσίους χεῖρας αὐτῷ.* Athenag. pp. 48, 49. ed. Oxon.

[r] *Τί δέ μοι ὁλοκαυτώσεων, ὧν μὴ δεῖται ὁ Θεός; καί τοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν.* Athenag. p. 49.

[s] Hence came the usual phrase, so frequent in liturgic Offices, *τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δῶρων σοι προσφέρομεν*, We present unto thee the things that are thine out of thy own gifts: that is, by way of acknowledgment. See the testimonies collected in Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. pp. 201, 312.

upon the distinction between the typical sacrifices of the Law[t], and the true sacrifices of the Gospel[u]. He seems to mean by typical there the same that St. Austin, before cited, meant by signs. Those external sacrifices were symbols, tokens, pledges of the true homage, or true sacrifice; which Irenaeus interprets of a contrite heart, faith, obedience, righteousness[x], &c. referring to several texts[y] of the Old Testament and New, which recommend true goodness as the acceptable sacrifice. He understands the Gospel incense, spoken of in Malachi[z], of the prayers of the saints[a], according to Rev. v. 8. He makes mention also of an altar in heaven, to which the prayers and oblations of the Church are supposed to ascend, and on which they are conceived to be offered by our great High Priest to God the Father[b]. The thought, very probably, was taken from the golden altar mentioned in the Apocalypse[c], and represented as bearing the mystical incense. The notion of a mystical altar in heaven became very frequent in the Christian writers after Irenaeus[d], and was in process of time taken into most of the old Liturgies, Greek, Latin, and Oriental; as is well known to as many as are at all conversant in them. The notion was not new: for the Old Testament speaks of prayers, as 'coming up to God's holy

[t] 'Per sacrificia autem et reliquas typicas observantias, putantes propitiari Deum, dicebat eis Samuel,' &c. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 247. edit. Bened.

[u] 'Verum sacrificium insinuans, quod offerentes propitiabuntur Deum, ut ab eo vitam percipiant: quemadmodum alibi ait; Sacrificium Deo cor tribulatum, odor suavitatis Deo, cor clarificans eum qui plasmavit.' Ibid. p. 248.

[x] 'Non sacrificia et holocaustomata quaerebat ab eis Deus, sed fidem, et obedientiam, et justitiam, propter illorum salutem.' Ibid. p. 249.

[y] 1 Sam. xv. 22. Psalm l. 14; li. 17. Isa. i. 16, 17. Jerem. vii. 22, 23. Hos. vi. 6. Philip. iv. 18.

[z] Malach. i. 11.

[a] 'In omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, et sacrificium purum. Incensa autem Joannes in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait sanctorum.' Iren. lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249.

[b] 'Est ergo altare in caelis (illic enim preces nostrae et oblationes diriguntur) et templum; quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait, Et apertum est templum Dei.' Iren. ibid.

[c] Rev. viii. 3, 5. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Dodwell on Incensing, pp. 39—44.

[d] Clemens Alex. p. 209. Origen. Hom. in Joan. xvii. p. 438. Gregor. Nazianz. vol. i. pp. 31, 484, 692. Chrysostom. in Heb. Hom. xi. p. 807. Cyrill. Alex. de Adorat. lib. ix. p. 310. Apostol. Constitut. lib. viii. cap. 13. Augustin. Serm. 351. de Poenit. p. 1357. tom. v.

dwelling-place, even to heaven [e]:' and the New Testament follows the same figure of speech, applying it both to prayers and alms-deeds, in the case of Cornelius [f].

Irenaeus, as I have observed, understood the incense, mentioned in the Prophet, of the evangelical sacrifice of prayer: but then it is to be further noted, that he distinguished between the incense and the pure offering, and so understood the latter of something else. He understood it of the alms or oblations that went along with the prayers; referring to St. Paul's doctrine, in Phil. iv. 18, which recommends charitable contributions, as 'an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God;' as also to Proverbs xix. 17, 'He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord [g].' Such were the pure offerings of the Church, in Irenaeus's account; and they were spiritual sacrifices: for it is the service, not the material offering, which God accepts in such cases, as Irenaeus himself has plainly intimated [h]. It must be owned that Irenaeus does speak of the eucharistical oblations under the notion of presents brought to the altar, offered up to God, for the agnizing him as Creator of the world, and as the giver of all good things, and for a testimony of our love and gratitude towards him on that score [i]. This he calls a pure sacrifice [k], present, offering, and the like: and since the bread and wine so offered were certainly material, how shall

[e] 2 Chron. xxx. 27. Compare Tobit iii. 16; xii. 12. Wisd. ix. 8.

[f] Acts x. 4.

[g] Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251.

[h] 'Qui enim nullius indigens est Deus, in se assumit bonas operationes nostras, ad hoc ut praestet nobis retributionem bonorum suorum.' Iren. ibid. p. 251.

[i] 'Suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura panis est accepit, et gratias egit, &c. . . . Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis praestat, primitias suorum munerum in Novo Testamento,' &c. Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 249.

[k] 'Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert, glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus. Per munus enim erga regem et honos et affectio ostenditur: quod in omni simplicitate et innocentia Dominus volens nos offerre, praedicavit, dicens, Cum igitur offers munus tuum ad altare,' &c. Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 250.

we distinguish the sacrifice he speaks of from a material sacrifice, or how can we call it a spiritual sacrifice? A learned foreigner, being aware of the seeming repugnancy, has endeavoured to reconcile the author to himself, by saying, that the eucharistical oblation may still be reckoned a spiritual sacrifice, on account of the prayers, lauds, and offerings going along with it, which are spiritual services[l]. Another learned gentleman observes, that according to Irenaeus, the very life and soul of the new oblation rests in the prayers by which it is offered up, and which finish or perfect the spiritual oblation[m]. The solution appears to be just, so far as it goes: but I would take leave to add to it, that the material offering, in this case, is not properly a present made to God, though brought before him: for it is not consumed (like a burnt offering) in God's immediate service, nor any part of it, but it goes entire to the use of man, not so much as any particle of it separated for God's portion, as in the legal sacrifices[n]. Therefore the material offering is not the sacrifice; but the communicant's agnizing the Creator by it; that is properly sacrifice, and spiritual sacrifice, of the same nature with lauds. I may add further, that those eucharistical oblations were, in Irenaeus's account, contributions to the Church and to the poor, as is plain by his referring to Prov. xix. 17, and Phil. iv. 18, which I noted before: and therefore he looked upon them as evangelical and spiritual sacrifices, falling under article the first of the recital given above. For it is not the matter of the contributions which constitutes the sacrifice, but it is the exercise of benevolence, and that is spiritual, and what God accepts. Under the Law, God

[l] 'Non satis sibi constare videtur Irenaeus, qui de sacrificiis spiritualibus antea locutus erat, deque iis acceperat vaticinium Malachiae, quod nunc contra ad oblationes istas eucharisticas trahere videtur. At bene cuncta se habent, si observemus et ipsam Eucharistiam ratione precum et gratiarum actionis, quae eam comitari solet, et oblationes quoque istas, quas cum Eucharistia conjungere moris erat, suum itidem locum inter sacrificia spiritualia promereri.' Buddaeus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. i. pp. 59, 60.

[m] 'Ex quibus patet animam oblationis novae, quae in Nov. Test. juxta Irenaeum fit, et a Christo instituta est, esse preces queis dona offeruntur. . . . Accedentibus precibus, quibus nomen Dei glorificatur, ipsi gratiae redduntur, donorumque sanctificatio expetitur, perficitur utique spiritualis illa atque eucharistica oblatio.' Pfaffius in Irenaei Fragm. p. 57.

[n] See above, p. 136.

accepted the external sacrifice, the material offering, as to legal effect: but under the Gospel, he accepts of nothing as to any salutary effect at all, but the spiritual service. This is the new oblation, the only one that is any way acceptable under the Gospel, being made 'in spirit and in truth.'

Some perhaps may object, that such spiritual oblation cannot justly be called new, since it was mentioned by the Prophets, and is as old as David at least, who speaks of the sacrifice of a contrite heart, and the like [o]. All which is very certain, but foreign to the point in hand. For let it be considered, 1. That the new covenant is really as old as Adam, and yet is justly called new. 2. That though spiritual sacrifices were always the most acceptable sacrifices, yet God did accept even of material sacrifices, under the Mosaical economy, as to legal effect; and so it was a new thing to put an end to such legal ordinances. 3. That when spiritual sacrifices obtained (as they all along did) under the Law, yet they obtained under veils, covers, or symbols; and so it was a new thing to accept of them, under the Gospel, stripped of all their covers and external signatures. 4. The Gospel sacrifices are offered in, by, and through Christ, expressly and explicitly; and so the spiritual sacrifices of the Gospel are offered in a new way, and under a new form [p]. These considerations appear sufficient to justify Irenaeus's calling the Christian oblation a new oblation: or it may be added, that new light, new force, and new degrees of perfection have been brought in by the Gospel to every part or branch both of speculative and practical religion.

I pass on to Clemens of Alexandria. He maintains constantly,

[o] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 264, alias 268.

[p] 'By him we are to offer: it is his merit and mediation that crowns the sacrifice. . . . This by him gives the characteristical difference of the Christian sacrifice from all others: for, otherwise, the sacrifice of praise was common to all times before and under the Law. You find in many Psalms a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but in none of them by him, in Christ's name. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name, says our Saviour; but hereafter his name will give virtue and efficacy to all our services: and therefore, to gain so gracious an advocate with the Father, our prayers and supplications are in the Liturgy offered up in his name, concluding always, by the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Bishop Lany's Sermon on Heb. xiii. 15. pp. 13, 14.

under some variety of expression, that spiritual sacrifices are the only Christian sacrifices. To the question, what sacrifice is most acceptable to God? he makes answer, in the words of the Psalmist, 'a contrite heart.' He goes on to say: 'How then shall I crown, or anoint, or what incense shall I offer unto the Lord? A heart that glorifies its Maker is a sacrifice of sweet odour unto God: these are the garlands, and sacrifices, and spices and flowers for God [q].' In another place, condemning the luxury of perfumes, he starts an objection, viz. that Christ our High Priest may be thought perhaps to offer incense, or perfumes, above: an objection grounded probably, either upon what the typical high priest did under the Law [r], or upon what is intimated of Christ himself under the Gospel [s]: to which Clemens replies, that our Lord offers no such perfume there, but what he does offer above is the spiritual perfume of charity [t]. He alluded, as it seems, to our Lord's philanthropy, in giving himself a sacrifice for mankind; unless we choose to understand it of our Lord's recommending the charity of his saints and servants at the high altar in heaven. Clemens elsewhere reckons up meekness, philanthropy, exalted piety, humility, sound knowledge, among the acceptable sacrifices [u], as they amount to sacrificing the old man, with the lusts and passions: to which he adds also the offering up our own selves; thereby glorifying him who was sacrificed for us. Such were this author's sentiments of the Christian sacrifices: he looked upon the Church itself as the altar here below, the collective body of Christians, sending up the sacrifice of prayer to heaven, with united voices: the best and holiest sacrifice of all, if sent up in righteousness [x]. He speaks slightly of the legal sacrifices, as being symbols only of evangelical righteousness [y]. He makes the just soul to be a holy

[q] Clemens Alex. Paedag. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 306. Cp. Strom. lib. ii. pp. 369, 370.

[r] Exod. xxx. 7.

[s] Rev. v. 8; viii. 3. Cp. Vitring. in loc.

[t] Τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης δεκτὸν ἀναφερεῖν τὸν Κύριον, τὴν πνευματικὴν εὐωδίαν, εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, &c. Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. cap. 8. p. 209.

[u] Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 836.

[x] Ibid. p. 848.

[y] Αἱ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν νόμον θυσίαι, τὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐσέβειαν ἀλληγοροῦσι. Ibid. p. 849.

altar[z]: and as to the sacrifice of the Church, it is 'speech exhaled from holy souls, while the whole mind is laid open before God, together with the sacrifice[a].' Elsewhere, the sacrifices of the Christian Gnostic he makes to be prayers, and lauds, and reading of Scripture, and psalms, and anthems[b]. Such were Clemens's general principles, in relation to Gospel sacrifices. He has not directly applied them to the particular instance of the Eucharist; though we may reasonably do it for him, upon probable presumption. It is manifest that he could not consistently own it for a sacrifice of ours, in any other view but as a service carrying in it such spiritual sacrifices as he has mentioned: in that view, it might be upon his principles a noble sacrifice, yea, a combination of sacrifices.

Tertullian may come next, a very considerable writer, who has a great deal to our purpose: I shall select what may suffice to shew his sentiments of the Christian sacrifices. Giving some account of them to the Pagans, in his famous Apology, he expresses himself thus: 'I offer unto God a fatter and nobler sacrifice, which himself hath commanded; viz. prayer sent out from a chaste body, an innocent soul, and a sanctified spirit: not worthless grains of frankincense, the tears of an Arabian tree[c],' &c. I shall only observe, that if Tertullian had understood the material elements of the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, how easy might it have been to retort upon him the worthless grains of wheat, and the like. But he had no such thought. Prayer and a good life were his sacrifice: and a noble one they are. In another place of his works, he says; 'We sacrifice indeed, but it is with pure prayer, as God has commanded; for God, the Creator of the universe, hath no need of any incense, or blood[d].'

[z] *Βωμὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς ἅγιον, τὴν δικαίαν ψυχήν.* p. 848. Cp. Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 4.

[a] *Ἡ θυσία τῆς ἐκκλησίας, λόγος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ψυχῶν ἀναθυμιώμενος, ἐκκαλυπτομένης ἅμα τῆς θυσίας, καὶ τῆς διανοίας ἁπάσης τῷ Θεῷ.* Clem. Alex. p. 848.

[b] *Θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ, εὐχαί τε καὶ αἶνοι, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἑστιάσεως ἐντεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν, ψαλμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὕμνοι,* &c. Strom. vii. pp. 860, 861.

[c] 'Offero ei opimam et majorem hostiam, quam ipse madavit; orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam: non grana thuris unius assis, Arabicae arboris lacrymas,' &c. Tertull. Apol. cap. xxx. p. 277. edit. Havercamp.

[d] 'Sacrificamus . . . sed quomodo Deus praecepit, pura prece: non

How obvious might it have been to retort, that God has no need of bread or wine, had that been the Christian sacrifice: but Tertullian knew better; and still he rests it upon pure prayer, that is, prayer together with a good mind. Let us hear him again: 'That we ought not to offer unto God earthly, but spiritual sacrifices, we may learn from what is written, The sacrifice of God is an humble and contrite spirit: and elsewhere, Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most High. So then, the spiritual sacrifices of praise are here pointed to, and a troubled spirit is declared to be the acceptable sacrifice unto God[e].' What Justin Martyr rejected as material sacrifice, our author here rejects under the name of earthly, or terrene. Are not bread and wine both of them terrene? Therefore he thought not of them, but of something spiritual: and he has named what; viz. lauds and thanksgivings, and discharge of sacred vows, all from an humble and contrite heart: these were the acceptable sacrifices, in his account. He goes on, in the same place, to quote Isaiah against carnal sacrifices, and Malachi also, to shew that spiritual sacrifices are established[f]. In his treatise against Marcion, he again refers to the Prophet Malachi, interpreting the pure offering there mentioned, not of any material oblation, but of hearty prayer from a pure conscience[g]; and elsewhere, of giving glory, and blessing, and lauds, and hymns[h]. Which, by the way, may serve for a comment upon Justin and Irenaeus, as to their applying that passage of Malachi to the Eucharist: they might do it, because the spiritual sacrifices here mentioned by Tertullian make a great part of the service. It would have been very

enim egit Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris, aut sanguinis alicujus.' Tertull. ad Scap. cap. ii. p. 69. Rigalt.

[e] 'Namque, quod non terrenis sacrificiis, sed spiritalibus, Deo litandum sit, ita legimus ut scriptum est, Cor contribulatum et humiliatum hostia Deo est. Et alibi, Sacrifica Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua. Sic igitur sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur, et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur.' Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. v. p. 188.

[f] Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. v. p. 188.

[g] 'Sacrificium mundum: scilicet simplex oratio de conscientia pura.' Tertull. contr. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 1. p. 414.

[h] 'Sacrificium mundum: gloriae scilicet relatio, et benedictio, et laus, et hymni.' Adv. Marc. lib. iii. cap. 22. p. 410.

improper to interpret one part of spiritual service, viz. of prayer, and the other of a material loaf. In another treatise, Tertullian numbers up among the acceptable sacrifices, conflicts of soul, fastings, watchings, and abstemiousness, with their mortifying appurtenances[i]. But besides all this, there is, if I mistake not, in the latter part of his Book of Prayer (published by Muratorius, A. D. 1713) a large and full description of the eucharistical sacrifice, which will be worth the transcribing at length. After recommending the use of psalmody along with prayers, and the making responses in the public service, he then declares that such kind of prayer, so saturated with psalmody, is like a well fed sacrifice: but it is of the spiritual kind, such as succeeded in the room of all the legal sacrifices. Then referring to Isaiah i. 11, to shew the comparative meanness of the Jewish sacrifices, and to John iv. 23, for the right understanding the evangelical, he proceeds thus: 'We are the true worshippers and the true priests, who worshipping in spirit, do in spirit sacrifice prayer, suitable to God and acceptable; such as he has required, and such as he has provided for himself. This is what we ought to bring to God's altar [by way of sacrifice] devoted from the whole heart, fed with faith, decked with truth, by innocence made entire, and clean by chastity, crowned with a feast of charity, attended with a train of good works, amidst the acclamations of psalms and anthems[k].' The reader will

[i] 'Sacrificia Deo grata: conflictationes dico animae, jejunia, seras et aridas escas, et appendices hujus officii sordes.' De Resurrect. Carn. cap. viii. p. 330.

[k] 'Diligentiores in orando subjungere in orationibus Alleluia solent, et hoc genus Psalmos, quorum clausulis respondeant, qui simul sunt: et est optimum utique institutum omne, quod proponendo et honorando Deo competit, saturatam orationem, velut optimam [opimam] hostiam admovere. Haec est enim hostia spiritalis, quae pristina sacrificia delevit. Quo mihi, inquit, multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum? ... Quae ergo quaesierit Deus, Evangelium docet: Veniet hora, inquit, cum veri adoratores adorabunt Patrem in spiritu et veritate; Deus enim Spiritus est, et adoratores itaque tales requirit. Nos sumus veri adoratores, et veri sacerdotes, qui Spiritu orantes, Spiritu sacrificamus orationem Dei propriam et acceptabilem, quam scilicet requisivit, quam sibi prospexit. Hanc de toto corde devotam, fide pastam, veritate curatam, innocentia integram, castitate mundam, agape coronatam, cum pompa bonorum operum inter psalmos et hymnos deducere ad Dei altare debemus.' Tertull. de Orat. cap. xxvii., xxviii. pp. 52, 53. edit. Murator.

here observe, how the author most elegantly describes the Christian and spiritual sacrifice of prayer, in phrases borrowed from material sacrifices; with an heifer, or bullock in his mind, led up to the altar to be sacrificed: and his epithets are all chosen, as the editor has justly observed, so as to answer that figure[l]. But what I am principally to note is, that this was really intended for a description of the eucharistical sacrifice: which is plain from the circumstances: 1. From his speaking of the public psalmody, as going along with it[m], and the responses made by the assembly. 2. From the mention made of God's altar. 3. And principally, from what he says of the feast of charity, which is known to have been connected with the service of the Eucharist, or to have been an appendage to it[n], at that time; for which reason, that service may very properly be said to have been crowned with it. These circumstances sufficiently shew, that Tertullian had the Communion Service in his mind, and that was the sacrifice which he there chose to describe; a complicated sacrifice, consisting of many articles, and all of them spiritual, but all summed up in a right faith, pure worship, and good life. Such is the Christian sacrifice; and such we ought to bring constantly to the Lord's table, to the holy and mystical altar.

To the same purpose speaks Minucius Felix, not long after Tertullian. The only gifts proper to be offered to God by Christians, are Christian services, Christian virtues, according to his account[o]. To offer him anything else, is throwing him back his own gifts, not presenting him with anything of ours. What could Minucius therefore have thought of offering him bread and

[l] 'Orationi, quam hostiam spiritalem appellat, singula tribuit, quae victimis carneis conveniebant, nimirum ut de toto corde voveatur Deo, ut sit pasta, curata, integra, munda, coronata.' Muratorius in Notis, p. 53.

[m] 'Quorum clausulis respondeant, qui simul sunt.'

[n] See Bingham, book xv. chap. 7. sect. 7, 8. Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. p. 26.

[o] 'Hostias et victimas Domino offeram, quas in usum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei suum munus? Ingratum est: cum sit litabilis hostia bonus animus, et pura mens, et sincera conscientia. Igitur, qui innocentiam colit, Domino supplicat; qui justitiam, Deo libat; qui fraudibus abstinet, propitiat Deum; qui hominem periculo subripit, opimam victimam caedit. Haec nostra sacrificia, haec Dei sacra sunt.' Minuc. Fel. sect. xxxii. p. 183.

wine, if considered as gifts or sacrifices to God? It is manifest, that he must have understood the service, not the elements, to be the Christian gift, and Christian sacrifice.

Origen falls in with the sentiments of the earlier Fathers, as to spiritual sacrifices, and their being the only Gospel sacrifices. For when Celsus had objected to Christians their want of altars, he replies: 'The objector does not consider, that, with us, every good man's mind is his altar, from whence truly and spiritually the incense of perfume is sent up: viz. prayers from a pure conscience [p].' Then he refers to Rev. v. 8, and to Psalm cxli. 2. A little higher up in the same treatise, he speaks of Christians presenting their petitions, sacrifices, and supplications; beseeching Christ, since 'he is the propitiation for our sins,' to recommend the same, in quality of High Priest, to the acceptance of God the Father [q]. We may here observe, that the altar which he speaks of is spiritual, as well as the sacrifice. Had he known of any material altar, or material sacrifice, (properly so called,) among Christians, this was the place for him to have named it. It is true, the Lord's table is often called altar in the ancient monuments, and it is a material table: and the alms also and oblations made at the same table, for the use of church and poor, are material, as well as the table. But the service is spiritual, and that is the sacrifice, there offered: and therefore the table, considered as an altar, an altar for spiritual sacrifice, is a mystical, spiritual altar. So if a man offers his own body as a sacrifice for the name of Christ upon a scaffold, his body is material, and so is the scaffold also: but nevertheless, the sacrifice is spiritual, and the scaffold, considered as an altar, must be a spiritual altar, to make it answer to the sacrifice, as they are correlates. This I hint by the way, in order to obviate some wrong constructions, which have been made [r] of

[p] Οὐχ ὁρῶν, ὅτι βωμοὶ μέν εἰσιν ἡμῖν τὸ ἑκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικὸν, ἀφ' οὗ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐώδη θυμιάματα, αἱ προσευχαὶ ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως καθαρᾶς. Origen. contra Cels. p. 755.

[q] Ὧι πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν, ἱλασμὸν ὄντα περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, προσαγαγεῖν ὡς Ἀρχιερέα τὰς εὐχὰς, καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ. p. 751.

[r] See Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 30, alias 31.

a material table and material elements. It is true, the table is material, and the elements also material: but so far as one is considered or called an altar, it is spiritual and mystical; and so far as the other are called a sacrifice, they also are spiritual and mystical. The holy table is called an altar, with regard to the spiritual services, that is, sacrifices sent up from it, and so it is a spiritual altar: then as it bears the symbols of the grand sacrifice applied in this service, and herein feasted upon by every worthy communicant, it is a symbolical or mystical table, answering to the symbolical and mystical banquet. But I pass on.

Cyprian, of that age, speaks as highly of spiritual sacrifices as any one before or after him. For in an epistle written to the confessors in prison, and not permitted to communicate there, he comforts them up in the manner here following: 'Neither your religion nor faith can suffer by the hard circumstances you are under, that the priests of God have not the liberty to offer and celebrate the holy sacrifices. You do celebrate, and you do offer unto God a sacrifice both precious and glorious, and which will much avail you towards your obtaining heavenly rewards. The holy Scripture says, The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart God doth not despise, Psalm li. 17. This sacrifice you offer to God, this you celebrate without intermission, day and night, being made victims to God, and presenting yourselves as such, holy and unblemished, pursuant to the Apostle's exhortation, where he says, I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies, &c. Rom. xii. 1. For this is what pleases God: and it is this by which our other services are rendered more worthy, for the engaging the Divine acceptance. This is the only thing that our devout and dutiful affections can offer under the name of a return for all his great and salutary blessings: for so by the Psalmist says the Spirit of God, What shall I render, &c. Psalm cxvi. 12, 13, 15. Who would not readily and cheerfully take this cup[s]?' The remarks here proper are as follow: 1. That the author looked upon the Eucharist as

[s] Cyprian, Epist. lxxvi. p. 232. ed. Oxon., alias Epist. lxxvii. p. 159. ed. Bened.

an oblation, or sacrifice, or complication of sacrifices. 2. That in case of injurious exclusion from it, he conceived that spiritual sacrifices alone were equivalent to it, or more than equivalent to the ordinary sacrifices therein offered. 3. That therefore he could not suppose any sacrifice offered in the Eucharist to be the archetypal sacrifice itself, or to be tantamount to it: which I note chiefly in opposition to Mr. Dodwell, who imagined that the ancients 'reckoned the Christian Eucharist for the archetypal sacrifice of Christ upon the cross[t]:' an assertion, which must be very much qualified and softened, to make it tolerable. The Eucharist, considered as a Sacrament, is indeed representative and exhibitive of the archetypal sacrifice; not as offered, but as feasted upon by us, given and applied by God and Christ to every worthy receiver. Therefore that excellently learned man inadvertently here confounded the sacrificial view of the Eucharist with the sacramental one, and man's part in it with what is properly God's. What we give to God is our own service, and ourselves, which is our sacrifice: but the archetypal sacrifice itself is what no one but Christ himself could offer, whether really or symbolically. We represent it, we do not offer it in the Eucharist; but it is there sacramentally or symbolically to us exhibited, or applied. 4. It may be noted of Cyprian, that he judged the devoting our whole selves to God's service and to God's glory, to be the most acceptable sacrifice which we are capable of offering: and his preferring the sacrifice of martyrdom (other circumstances supposed equal) to the ordinary sacrifice of the Eucharist, was conformable to the standing principles of the Church, in preferring the baptism of blood to the baptism of water[u].

It remains to be inquired, in how many senses, or upon what accounts, St. Cyprian styled the Eucharist a sacrifice. 1. He might so style it on account of the lay-offerings therein made, which were a spiritual sacrifice[v]. 2. Next, on account of the sacerdotal recommendation of the same offerings to the Divine

[t] Dodwell of Incense, p. 55.
[u] Vid. Dodwell, Cyprian. Dissert. xiii. p. 420, &c.
[v] See above, chap. i. p. 26.

acceptance[x]: which was another spiritual sacrifice. 3. On account of the prayers, lauds, hymns, &c. which went along with both the former, and were emphatically spiritual sacrifice. 4. On account of the Christian charity and brotherly love signified by and exemplified in the service of the Eucharist: for that Cyprian looked upon as a prime sacrifice of it[y]. 5. On account of the grand sacrifice applied by Christ, commemorated and feasted on by us (not properly offered) in the Eucharist[z]. Such commemoration is itself a spiritual service, of the same nature with lauds, and so makes a part of the spiritual sacrifice of the Eucharist. In these several views, Cyprian might, or probably did, look upon the Eucharist as a sacrifice, and accordingly so named it.

There is one particular passage in Cyprian, which has been often pleaded by Romanists in favour of a real sacrificing of Christ in the Eucharist, and sometimes by Protestants, amongst ourselves, in favour of a material sacrifice at least, or of a symbolical offering up of Christ's body and blood to God the Father. The words of Cyprian run thus: 'If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered himself a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of himself; then that Priest truly acts in Christ's stead, who imitates what Christ did, and then offers a true and complete sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, if he begins so to offer, as he sees Christ to have offered before[a].' From hence it has been pleaded, that

[x] See above, p. 26. Pope Innocent I. clearly expresses both, in these words: 'De nominibus vero recitandis, antequam preces sacerdos faciat, atque eorum oblationes, quorum nomina recitanda sunt, sua oratione commendet, quam superfluum sit, et ipse pro tua prudentia recognoscis: ut cujus hostiam nec dum Deo offeras, ejus ante nomen insinues,' &c. Harduin. Concil. tom. i. p. 997.

[y] 'Sic nec sacrificium Deus recipit dissidentis.... Sacrificium Deo majus est pax nostra et fraterna concordia, et de unitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti plebs adunata.' Cyprian. de Orat. p. 211. edit. Bened., p. 150. Oxon.

[z] See above, chap. i. pp. 25, 31.

[a] 'Si Jesus Christus, Dominus et Deus noster, ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem praecepit; utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.' Cyprian. Ep. lxiii. p. 109. And see above, ch. i. p. 25.

Christ offered himself in the Eucharist, and that the Christian Priests ought to do the same that he did; that is, to offer, or sacrifice, Christ himself in this Sacrament. But it is not certain that Cyprian did mean (as he has not plainly said) that Christ offered himself in the Eucharist: he might mean only, that Christ offered himself upon the cross, and that he instituted this Sacrament as a commemoration of it. As to the words true and complete sacrifice, he certainly meant no more, than that Christ offered both bread and wine, and had left it us in charge to do the same: and this he observed in opposition to some of that time, who affected to mutilate the Sacrament by leaving out the wine, and using water instead of it, which was not doing the same that Christ did.

However, I think it not material to dispute whether Cyprian really intended to teach, that our Lord offered himself in the Eucharist, since it is certain, that some Fathers of eminent note in the Church, after his days, did plainly and in terms affirm it[b]: and other Fathers admitted of our Lord's offering, or devoting himself previously to the passion[c]. And they are therein followed by several learned moderns, even among Protestants[d]; who ground the doctrine chiefly on John xvii. 19. A sufficient answer to the objection (so far as concerns the Romish plea built thereupon) is given by our incomparable Bishop Jewel, in these words: 'We deny not but it may well be said, Christ at his last supper offered up himself unto his Father: albeit, not really and indeed, but in a figure, or in a mystery; in such sort as we say, Christ was offered in the sacrifices of the old Law, and, as

[b] Hilarius, in Matt. c. xxxi. p. 743. ed. Bened. Ambrosius, de Myster. Paschae, c. 1. Gregor. Nyssen. de Resurr. Christi, seu Pasch. i. Hesychius in Levit. pp. 55, 56; cp. 169, 376, 540. Cp. Steph. Gobar. apud Phot. Cod. 232. p. 902. Missal. Gotho-Gallican. p. 297. et Mabillon. in Praefat. et alibi.

[c] Chrysostom. in Joan. Hom. lxxxii. 484. Cyril. Alex. de Adorat. lib. x. p. 350. In Joan. lib. iv. c. 2. p. 354.

[d] Mede, Opp. p. 14. Outram de Sacrif. pp. 307, 370. Witsius, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. i. dissert. 2. not 87. In Symb. Apost. Exercit. x. p. 147. Whitby on John xvii. 19. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 251. Deylingius, Observat. Miscel. p. 560. Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 61—96. part ii. pp. 4—10. N.B. These authors suppose that our Lord devoted himself beforehand, gave himself on the cross, presented himself in heaven: one continued oblation in all, but distinguished into three several parts, views, or stages.

St. John says, The lamb was slain from the beginning of the world, as Christ was slain at the table, so was he sacrificed at the table; but he was not slain at the table verily and indeed, but only in a mystery[e].' This is a just and full answer to the Romanists, with whom the good Bishop held the debate. But it may still be pleaded by those who maintain a material sacrifice, that this answer affects not them, since they contend only, that Christ offered the symbols in the Eucharist, and himself under those symbols, that is, in a mystery; just as a man offers to God houses or lands, by presenting a sword, or piece of money, or pair of gloves, upon the altar of a church, or transfers an estate by delivery of parchments, and the like: and if Christ thus symbolically offered himself a sacrifice in the Eucharist, why may he not be, in like manner, symbolically offered in the Eucharist at this day[f]? This, I think, is the sum and substance of what is pleaded by some Protestants in favour of a symbolical sacrifice, as offered in the Eucharist. To which I answer: 1. That no one has any authority or right to offer Christ as a sacrifice (whether really or symbolically) but Christ himself. Such a sacrifice is his sacrifice, not ours; offered for us, and not by us, to God the Father. If Christ in the institution offered himself under those symbols, (which however does not appear[g],) he might have a right to do it: we have none, and so can only commemorate what he did, and by the same symbols. 2. If we symbolically sacrifice anything in the Eucharist, it is only in such a sense as St. Austin (hereafter to be quoted) speaks of; where he considers the bread and wine as symbols of the united body of the Church. We may so symbolically offer up, or sacrifice ourselves, and that is all: more than that cannot comport with Scripture, or with the principle of the ancients, that all our sacrifices are made in and by Christ. He is not the matter or subject of our sacrifices, but the Mediator of them: we offer not him, but we offer what we do offer, by him[h]. 3. If the thing

[e] Jewel, Answer to Harding, p. 417; compare pp. 426, 427.

[f] See Johnson's Collection of Saxon Laws, &c. praef. p. 57, &c.

[g] Vid. Sam. Basnag. Annal. tom. i. pp. 371, 372.

[h] Heb. xiii. 15. 'Per Jesum Christum offert Ecclesia. . . . Non recepe-

symbolically offered in the Eucharist were Christ himself, then the offerer or offerers must stand in the place of Christ, and be as truly the symbols of Christ in their offering capacity, as the elements are supposed to be in their sacrificial capacity. Then not only the Priests, but the whole Church, celebrating the Eucharist, must symbolically represent the person of Christ, and stand in his stead: a notion which has no countenance in Scripture or antiquity, but is plainly contradicted by the whole turn and tenor of all the ancient Liturgies, as well as by the plain nature and reason of the thing. 4. I may add, lastly, that all the confusion, in this article, seems to arise from the want of distinguishing the sacrificial part of the Eucharist from the sacramental one, as before noted: we do not offer Christ to God in the Eucharist, but God offers Christ to us, in return for our offering ourselves. We commemorate the grand sacrifice, but do not reiterate it; no not so much as under symbols. But God applies it by those symbols or pledges: and so, though there is no symbolical sacrifice of that kind, neither can be, yet there is a symbolical grant, and a symbolical banquet, which is far better, and which most effectually answers all purposes. In short, there is, as the Apostle assures us, a communion of Christ's body and blood, in the Eucharist, to every worthy receiver. The real and natural body is, as it were, under symbols and pledges, conveyed to us here, where the verity is not: but to talk of our sending the same up thither, under the like pledges, where the verity itself is, carries no appearance of truth or consistency; neither hath it any countenance either in Scripture or antiquity.

I now go on to Lactantius, who is supposed to have flourished about A. D. 318. The Christian sacrifices which he speaks of, are meekheartedness, innocent life, and good works. He allows of no sacrifices but of the incorporeal invisible kind, being that such only are fit for God, who is incorporeal and invisible, to receive, under the last and most perfect dispensation of the

runt verbum per quod offertur Deo.' Iren. lib. iv. c. 17, 18. pp. 249, 251. ed. Bened. *τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ δεδιδάγμεθα.* Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 39. Cp. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, lib. x. c. 20. Apostol. Const. lib. ii. c. 25. pp. 240, 241.

Gospel. He distinguishes between gifts and sacrifices, because the Pagans had so distinguished: but in the last result, he lays no stress upon that distinction, indifferently reckoning a good life, either as a gift or a sacrifice. However, where he seems at all to distinguish, he chooses to make integrity the gift, and such an one as shall continue for ever; while he appropriates the name of sacrifice, emphatically so used, to lauds, hymns, and the like, which he supposes are appointed for a time only [i].

We may now come down to Eusebius, of the same century, a man of infinite reading, and particularly conversant in Christian antiquities. He speaks of 'the venerable sacrifices of Christ's table, by which officiating, we are taught to offer up to God supreme, during our whole lives, the unbloody, spiritual, and to him most acceptable sacrifices, through the High Priest of his, who is above all [k].' For the clearer understanding of what he meant by 'the unbloody, spiritual sacrifices,' let him explain himself in the same page, where he says: 'The prophetic oracles make mention of these incorporeal and spiritual sacrifices: Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High.' And again, 'The sacrifice of God is a contrite spirit [l],' &c. Hence it is manifest, that Eusebius did not mean by sacrifices the sacred symbols, which are corporeal, but the spiritual services of prayers, praises, and a contrite heart, as he expressly mentions. Which will appear still the plainer, by his quoting, soon after, the noted place of Malachi, and expounding

[i] 'Quisquis igitur his omnibus praeceptis caelestibus obtemperaverit, hic cultor est veri Dei, cujus sacrificia sunt mansuetudo animi, et vita innocens, et actus boni. . . . Duo sunt quae offerri debeant, donum et sacrificium: donum in perpetuum, sacrificium ad tempus. . . . Deo utrumque incorporale offerendum est, quo utitur. Donum est integritas animi, sacrificium laus et hymnus. Si enim Deus non videtur, ergo his rebus coli debet, quae non videntur. . . . Summus igitur colendi Dei ritus est, ex ore justi hominis ad Deum directa laudatio.' Lactant. de vero Cultu, lib. vi. c. 24, 25.

[k] Τὰ *σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιεροῦντες, τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας, διὰ παντὸς βίου, τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων προσφέρειν Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ πάντων ἀνωτάτου ἀρχιερέως αὐτοῦ δεδιδάγμεθα.* Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 39.

[l] Ταύτας *δὲ πάλιν τὰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ νοερὰς θυσίας τὰ προφητικὰ κηρύττει λόγια . . . θῦσον τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχάς σου . . . καὶ πάλιν, θυσία τῷ Θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον.* Euseb. ibid. p. 39.

both the incense and pure offering, of prayers and praises. His comment is worth the reciting: 'We offer therefore to God supreme the sacrifice of praise: we offer the holy, the venerable sacrifice, which hath a decorous sanctity: we offer after a new way, according to the New Testament, the pure sacrifice: for the sacrifice to God is said to be a contrite spirit[m].' He goes on to sum up all in very strong and remarkable words, as here follows: 'Therefore we offer both sacrifice and incense: first, celebrating the memorial of the grand sacrifice by those mysteries which he has ordained, and presenting our thanksgivings for our salvation, by devout hymns and prayers. Next, we offer up ourselves to him, and to the Logos, his High Priest, resting upon him both with body and soul. Whereupon we endeavour to preserve to him our bodies pure and untainted from all filthiness, and to bring him minds free from all evil affection and stain of maliciousness, and take care to honour him by purity of thought, sincerity of affection, and soundness of principles; for these, we are taught, are more acceptable to him than a multitude of sacrifices, streaming with blood, and smoke, and nidor[n].'

This is an admirable description of the eucharistical solemnity, of the sacrifices contained in it, and of the ends and uses of it, and likewise of the preparation proper for it. But my present concern is only with the sacrificial view of it. Eusebius here takes notice, in the first place, of the grand sacrifice: which is no sacrifice of ours, but we make a memorial of it; and that very memorial is indeed an article of spiritual service, and so of course makes a part of our own spiritual sacrifice in the Eucharist[o]. The rest is made up of such other sacrifices as the author has there handsomely enumerated. I shall only observe further of Eusebius, for the cutting off all possible cavils about

[m] *Θύομεν δῆτα τοιγαροῦν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως· θύομεν τὸ ἔνθεον καὶ σεμνὸν καὶ ἱεροπρεπὲς θῦμα· θύομεν καινῶς κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν· θυσία δὲ τῷ Θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον εἴρηται.* Euseb. ibid. p. 40; cp. c. vi. pp. 19, 20, 21, et in Psalm. p. 212.

[n] Euseb. ibid. c. x. p. 40.

[o] I observed above, p. 322, note p, that the legal incense was a memorial, and it was burnt over the show-bread, Lev. xxiv. 7. In like manner, our commemorative service is offered up to God over the elements, and is part of our Gospel incense, consisting of prayers, lauds, self-humiliation, &c.

his meaning, that in another work of his he expressly teaches, that the unbloody sacrifices will be offered to God, not only in this life present, but also in the life to come [p]. Certainly, he could not intend it of the eucharistic symbols, but of something else. Cyril of Alexandria has followed him in the same thought, where he supposes the angels to offer the unbloody sacrifices [q].

Were I now to go on to other Fathers, down to the sixth century, or further, it might be tedious to the reader: but they will all be found constant and uniform in one tenor of doctrine, rejecting all material, corporeal, terrene, sensible sacrifices, and admitting none but spiritual, such as I have mentioned. Neither is there any difference concerning that point between Justin of the second, and Cyril of the fifth century, but that the latter is more full and express for the same thing. However, I shall go on a little further, making choice of a few testimonies, appearing most considerable either for their weight or their accuracy. I pass over Hilary and Basil, with bare references to the pages [r]: but Gregory Nazianzen may deserve our more especial notice. He was eminently called the Divine, for his exactness of judgment, and his consummate knowledge in theology; and he has some remarkable passages, very apposite to our present purpose. About the year 379, putting the case, that possibly, through the iniquity of the times, he might be driven from the altar, and debarred the benefit of the Eucharist, he comforts himself thus: 'Will they drive me from the altars? But I know, there is another altar, whereof these visible ones are but the figures,

[p] Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι δὲ αἰῶνι, τὰ λογικὰ δῶρα καὶ τὰς ἀναιμάκτας τῷ Θεῷ θυσίας ἀναπέμπων οὐ διαλιμπάνει ὁ δηλωθεὶς λαός. Euseb. in Hesai. xviii. p. 427.

[q] Cyrill. Alexandr. de Recta Fide, p. 160. N. B. The learned author of Unbloody Sacrifice once thought, that mere spiritual sacrifices were never called unbloody: but he found afterwards that prayers had that epithet given them by Constantine. Apud Sozom. lib. ii. c. 15. He might have added Greg. Nyssen. de Poenit. p. 170. As to this place of Cyril, he supposes it meant of offering Christ's body in heaven. Addend. to part i. in part ii. p. 266. A strange thought! especially considering that angels are supposed by Cyril to be the offerers. Compare what Lactantius says above of gifts, as continuing for ever, meaning the tribute of homage, &c., and so all is clear.

[r] Hilarius, pp. 154, 228, 534, 535. edit. Bened. Basil. tom. iii. pp. 2, 270. edit. Bened.

&c. . . . To that will I present myself, there will I offer the acceptable services, sacrifice, oblation, and holocausts, preferable to those now offered, as much as truth is preferable to shadow. . . . . From this altar no one, who has ever so much a mind to it, shall be able to debar me[s].' Here we may observe, how Nazianzen prefers the spiritual sacrifices even before the sacrifice of the altar, externally considered. A plain argument, that he did not look upon it as the archetypal sacrifice: for, if he had, he could never have been so presumptuous or profane, as to prefer any sacrifice of his own to the sacrifice of Christ. He looked upon the eucharistical sacrifice, externally considered, and in its representative, commemorative view, to be no more than the figure of the archetypal, and a sign of the spiritual sacrifices: therefore he justly preferred the substance before shadows, and the real sacrifice of the heart, before the outward symbols[t]; the offering of which was not sacrificing at all, but representing a sacrifice, or sacrifices.

There is another passage of Nazianzen, worth the reciting; and so I shall throw it in here, with some proper remarks upon it. He had been setting forth the dignity and danger of the sacerdotal function, which for some time he had studiously declined; and among other considerations, he urges one, drawn from the weighty concern of well-administering the holy Communion, as here follows: 'Knowing that no man is worthy of the great God, and Sacrifice, and High Priest, who has not first presented himself a living holy sacrifice unto God, and exhibited the rational acceptable service, and offered to God the sacrifice of praise, and the contrite spirit, (which is the only sacrifice that God, who giveth all things, demands from us back again,) how

[s] *Θυσιαστηρίων εἴρξουσιν; ἀλλ' οἶδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, οὗ τύποι τὰ νῦν ὁρώμενα· τούτῳ... παραστήσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτὰ, θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια. . . . τούτου μὲν οὐκ ἀπάξει με τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος.* Greg. Nazianz. Orat. xxviii. p. 484. Cp. Albertinus, p. 474.

[t] Hence it may be observed, that the eucharistical sacrifice began to be more and more confined to one particular meaning, and to be understood in a narrow sense, as denoting the representation of a sacrifice: otherwise there would have been no room for Nazianzen's preferring one to another; for it would have been opposing spiritual sacrifice to spiritual, and would not have answered.

shall I dare to offer him the external sacrifice, the antitype of the great mysteries? or how shall I take upon me the character or title of a priest, before I have purified my hands with holy works [u]?' Here it may be noted, 1. That the author distinguishes very carefully between the external sacrifice in the Eucharist, and the internal, between the symbolical and the real. 2. That he did not judge the external sacrifice to be really a sacrifice, or to be more than nominal, since he opposes it to the real, internal sacrifices, judging them to be the only sacrifices required. 3. That he judged the external sacrifice to be the sign, symbol, or figure [x] of a true sacrifice, (viz. of the grand sacrifice,) improperly or figuratively called a sacrifice, by a metonymy of the sign for the thing signified [y]. 4. That such external, nominal sacrifice has also the name of oblation [z], in the same figurative, metonymical way, as it was presenting to God the signs and symbols of the body broken, and blood shed, and pleading the merits of the passion there represented. 5. That the name of rational or spiritual service, borrowed from St. Paul [a], is not a name for the external sacrifice, in our author, but for the internal of prayers, praises, contrite heart, &c. 6. That the external sacrifice, (being

[u] Ταῦτα οὖν εἰδὼς ἐγὼ, καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος, καὶ Ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, μηδὲ ἔθυσε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον (ἦν μόνον ὁ πάντα δοὺς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν) πῶς ἔμελλον θαρρῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον; ἢ πῶς ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδύεσθαι, πρὶν ὁσίοις ἔργοις τελειῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας; Greg. Nazianz. Orat. i. p. 38.

[x] This is intimated by the word ἀντίτυπον. Cp. Orat. xi. p. 187. Orat. xvii. p. 273. Of which word see Albertinus, pp. 273—283. Pfaffius. pp. 131—145.

[y] Vid. Suicer. Thesaur. tom. i. pp. 1423, 1424.

[z] Intimated in the word προσφέρειν. Cp. Cyrill. Hierosol. Myst. v. c. 9. p. 328.

'Christ is, in some sense, offered up to God by every communicant in the Sacrament, when he does mentally and internally offer him to God, and present, as it were, his bleeding Saviour to his Father, and desire him for his sake to be merciful to him, and forgive him his sins. This internal oblation of Christ and his passion is made by every faithful Christian, &c. . . . The Minister also . . . . does offer, as it were, Jesus Christ and his sacrifice for the people,' &c. Dr. Payne's Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass, A.D. 1688, pp. 52, 53. Compare Abp. Sharpe, vol. vii. serm. xi. p. 251, and Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 315, and Pfaffius, who says, This no Protestants deny, pp. 106, 314, 344. The oblation, in this view, is but another name for commemoration; as I have often noted before.

[a] Rom. xii. 1. λογικὴ λατρεία.

the same with the memorial,) if considered as more than vocal, and making a part of the thanksgiving service, may be justly reputed a sacrifice of the spiritual kind, falling under the head of sacrifice of praise. 7. That the spiritual sacrifices, whether considered as previous qualifications, or present services of priests and people, were thought to be the only true and proper sacrifices performed [b] in the Eucharist: and therefore so far as it is itself a sacrifice, and not barely a sign of a former sacrifice, it is a spiritual sacrifice. 8. Those spiritual sacrifices were believed essential to the Eucharist, considered either as a sacrifice or a salutary sacrament: for, without such spiritual sacrifices, there was no sacrifice performed at all, but a representation of a sacrifice [c]; and not of ours, but of our Lord's. And though the Eucharist would still be a sacrament, (not a sacrifice,) yet it could not be salutary either to administrator or receiver, for want of the spiritual sacrifices, to give it life and efficacy; as is here sufficiently intimated by Nazianzen.

There is a commentary upon Isaiah, which has been ascribed to St. Basil by critics of the first rate, but yet is probably rejected, as none of his, by the last learned editor of Basil's works; who allows it however to be an useful piece, and as early as the fourth century, or thereabout. What I mention him for is, that, instead of all the legal sacrifices, he admits of two only, under the Gospel; our Lord's upon the cross, and ours, which consists in every man's offering his own self [d]. There is another author, who has commonly gone under the name of St. Chrysostom, but is now rejected as spurious, who divides the sacrifices of the Gospel after the same way: only the latter of the two he subdivides into nine, and so makes ten in all [e], and all of the spiritual kind. Cyril of Alexandria has a great many

[b] I say, performed: there is another sacrifice represented, commemorated, which was performed 1700 years ago upon the cross.

[c] 'Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis, ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur: in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur: post ascensum Christi per sacramentum memoriae celebratur.' Augustin. contr. Faust. lib. xx. c. 21. p. 348. tom. viii. edit. Bened.

[d] Pseudo-Basil. in Isa. p. 398, &c. tom. i. edit. Bened.

[e] Pseudo-Chrysostom. in Psal. xcv. p. 631. inter spuria, edit. Bened. tom. v.

things very clear and express to our present purpose [f]: but there is one particular passage in his tenth book against Julian, which is so plain, and so full for spiritual sacrifices, in opposition to all material or corporeal sacrifices whatsoever, that nothing can be more so. Comparing the sacrifices of Christians with those of the Jews, he writes thus: 'We sacrifice now much better than they of old did: for here descendeth from heaven, not any sensible fire for a symbol of the ineffable nature but, the Holy Spirit himself, from the Father by the Son, enlightening the Church, and receiving our sacrifices, namely, the spiritual and mental ones. The Israelites offered up to God bullocks and sheep, turtles and pigeons; yea, and first fruits of the earth, fine flour with oil poured upon it, cakes, and frankincense: but we, discarding all such gross service, are commanded to perform one that is fine and abstracted, intellectual and spiritual. For we offer up to God, for a sweetsmelling savour, all kinds of virtues, faith, hope, charity, righteousness, temperance [g],' &c. Here it is to be noted, that Cyril rejects absolutely all corporeal sacrifices, and not only the bloody ones of bulls and goats, and the like. He opposes the Christian mental sacrifices to the sacrifices of fine flour and cakes, and other such gross and sensible sacrifices. How could he do this, if he thought the elements of the Eucharist were a sacrifice or sacrifices? Are bread and wine at all less gross, or less sensible, than fine flour, cakes, and oil, and other fruits of the earth? Or have they any other claim to the name of mental and spiritual sacrifices, than the other also might justly have? Therefore it is plain, that Cyril never admitted the material elements of the Eucharist, as any part of the Christian sacrifice; but the spiritual service performed in it, that was the sacrifice. The material elements were signs and symbols of our Lord's sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself, nor any sacrifice at all, in strict propriety of speech: for our own proper sacrifice, as distinct from our Lord's, are our own services of prayer and praise, of faith, and of a good life. Such is the constant doctrine of all antiquity.

[f] Cyril. Alex. contr. Julian. lib. ix. p. 830. pp. 307, 308. Comment. in Isa. lib. i. Orat. i. pp. 14, 15. In Malach. i. 11.

[g] Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. x. p. 345.

I shall close this account with the sentiments of the great St. Austin. His treatise De Civitate Dei may be called his masterpiece, being his most learned, most correct, and most elaborate work; which lay upon his hands thirteen years, from 413 to 426: he died in 431. Here then we may expect to find his maturest sentiments, laid down with the utmost exactness, relating to the sacrifice of the Eucharist. He comprises all the Gospel sacrifices under two: one of which is our Lord's own sacrifice upon the cross; and the other is the Church's offering herself. The first of these is represented and participated in the Eucharist, the latter is executed: this is the sum of his doctrine. Of the former he observes [h], that it succeeded in the room of the legal sacrifices which prefigured it: of the latter he observes, that the legal sacrifices were signs or symbols of it [i]. The legal sacrifices were, in a prophetic and propitiatory view, figures of the former, and in a tropological view, figures of the latter. The body of Christ he considers as twofold, natural and mystical; one of which is represented by us, and exhibited by Christ in the Eucharist; the other is offered as a proper spiritual sacrifice [k]: and the bread and wine in the Eucharist are considered as symbols of both. I say, he considers the sacramental elements not merely as symbols of the natural body, but of the mystical also, viz. the Church [l], represented by the one loaf and the one

[h] 'Id enim sacrificium successit ōmnibus sacrificiis Veteris Testamenti, quae immolabantur in umbra futuri.' 'Pro illis omnibus sacrificiis et oblationibus corpus ejus offertur, et participantibus ministratur.' August. de Civit. Dei, lib. xvii. cap. 21. p. 484.

[i] 'Per hoc et sacerdos est, et ipse oblatio: cujus rei sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesia sacrificium, quae cum ipsius capitis corpus sit, seipsam per ipsum discit offerre. Hujus veri sacrificii multiplicia variaque signa erant sacrificia prisca sanctorum, cum ob hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis res una diceretur, ut sine fastidio multum commendaretur. Huic summo veroque sacrificio cuncta sacrificia falsa cesserunt.' Ibid. lib. x. cap. 20. p. 256. Cp. lib. xix. cap. 23. p. 227.

[k] 'Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum, multi unum corpus in Christo: quod etiam sacramento altaris, fidelibus noto, frequentat Ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert ipsa offeratur.' Ibid. lib. x. c. 6. p. 243.

'Hujus autem praeclarissimum atque optimum sacrificium nos ipsi sumus, hoc est, civitas ejus: cujus rei mysterium celebramus oblationibus nostris, quae fidelibus notae sunt.' Lib. xix. cap. 23. p. 226.

[l] 'Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, Apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, Vos estis corpus Christi et membra. Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium ves-

cup: so that by the same symbols we symbolically consign ourselves over to God, and God consigns Christ, with all the merits of his death and passion, over to us. At length, his notion of the eucharistical sacrifice resolves into one compound idea of a spiritual sacrifice, (wherein the communicants offer up themselves,) commemorative of another sacrifice, viz. the grand sacrifice. The offering of the body of Christ is a phrase capable of two meanings; either to signify the representing the natural body, or the devoting the mystical body: and both are included in the eucharistical service. Such appears to be St. Austin's settled judgment in this article, grounded, as I said, upon St. Paul's. It is a most ridiculous pretence of Father Harduin, (which he pursues through many tedious pages [m],) that, according to St. Austin, Christ's natural body is the sign, and his mystical body the thing signified in the Eucharist: for nothing is plainer from St. Austin, than that the bread and wine are the only signs, and that the things signified by them are both the natural and the mystical body of Christ, both his flesh and his Church. As the word 'offer' is a word of some latitude, he supposes both to be offered in the Eucharist; one by way of memorial before God, and the other as a real and spiritual sacrifice unto God.

Having thus traced this matter down through four centuries, and part of the fifth, I cannot think it of moment to descend lower, since the earliest are of principal value, and are alone sufficient. The Fathers were very wise and excellent men, saw very clearly what many learned moderns have had the misfortune to overlook, and agreed perfectly well in many points, about which the moderns have been strangely divided. The Fathers well understood, that to make Christ's natural body the real sacrifice of the Eucharist, would not only be absurd in reason, but highly presumptuous and profane; and that to make the outward symbols a proper sacrifice, a material sacrifice, would be

trum in mensa Domini positum est, mysterium Domini accipitis . . . Nihil hic de nostro adseramus; ipsum Apostolum item audiamus: cum ergo de isto Sacramento loqueretur, ait; Unus panis, unum corpus, multi sumus. . . . Recolite enim, quia panis non fit de uno grano, sed de multis.' Augustin. serm. ccxxix. p. 976. Cp. serm. cclxxii. p. 1103.

[m] Harduin. de Sacramento Altaris, cap. x.

entirely contrary to Gospel principles, degrading the Christian sacrifice into a Jewish one, yea, and making it much lower and meaner than the Jewish, both in value and dignity [n]. The right way therefore was, to make the sacrifice spiritual: and it could be no other upon Gospel principles. Thus both extremes were avoided, all perplexities removed, and truth and godliness secured.

So then here I may take leave of the ancients, as to the present article. The whole of the matter is well comprised and clearly expressed in a very few words, by as judicious a Divine as any our Church has had: 'We offer up our alms; we offer up our prayers, our praises, and ourselves: and all these we offer up in the virtue and consideration of Christ's sacrifice, represented before us [I would only add, "and before God"] by way of remembrance or commemoration; nor can it be proved, that the ancients did more than this: this whole service was their Christian sacrifice, and this is ours [o].' A learned foreigner has likewise very briefly and justly expressed the nature of the Christian sacrifice; whose words I have thrown to the bottom of the page [p], for the learned reader.

I shall now shut up this chapter with two or three short corollaries, which naturally offer, and may be of some use.

1. The first is, that this sacrificial view of the Eucharist squares exactly with the federal view before given. For if it be really a spiritual sacrifice, in or by which every faithful commu-

[n] How contemptibly the Romanists speak of a material sacrifice in that view, may be seen in Bishop Morton, (p. 438,) who has collected their sentiments upon it.

[o] Archbishop Sharpe, vol. vii. serm. xi. p. 253. If any one is disposed to trace this matter down, even to the dark ages, he will find that most of the Greek and Latin Liturgies contain the same notion with the Fathers, of the spiritual sacrifice in the Eucharist. See Covel, Acc. of Gr. Church, pref. p. 47; book, pp. 36, 41, 46, 53, 67, 68, 175. Deyling. Observat. Miscellan. p. 310, &c.

[p] 'Oblatio omnis quae fit a credentibus sub Novo Testamento, est incruenta, et vero castissima, et simplicissima, quia spiritualis. Sive quis se ipsum, sive σῶμα suum, affectum, omnesque suas facultates et actiones Deo offerat ut sacrificium; sive alia σχέσει, ministri verbi, qui in nobis convertendis laborarunt, nos offerant Deo; sive preces, εὐχαριστίας, supplicationes nostras feramus ad Deum, ubique eadem ratio: nullus hic funditur sanguis, nihil committitur violentum; actio tota est spiritualis, et λογική.' Vitringa in Isa. lxvi. 21. p. 951.

nicant devotes himself entirely to God; and if the sacerdotal offering up our Lord's mystical body be (as St. Austin explains this matter) a sacerdotal devoting all the faithful joining it, to God's service, and to God's glory: then may we again justly conclude, that the sacramental service is a federal, as well as a sacrificial solemnity: because, in this case, the administrator's devoting the communicants, and their devoting themselves to God, is tantamount to a solemn renewing former engagements or covenants made with him, under such symbols as God has appointed, and promised to ratify on his part.

2. From hence may be understood, how Christians, at large, are priests unto God [q]: for every one that sacrificeth, is so far a priest. Therefore Justin Martyr represents Christians in common as so many priests, offering their sacrifices in the Eucharist [r]. And Isidorus, so late as the fifth century, does the like [s], reckoning every man a priest, when he offers up his own body, or himself, a sacrifice unto God, by sacrificing his lusts and passions. Nevertheless, the proper officers, who minister in holy things, and who offer up to God both the sacrifices and sacrificers, are priests in a more eminent and emphatical sense; as Isidorus observes in the same place, and as the reason of the thing itself sufficiently evidences [t]. I may further note, that as Christians at large were considered as priests, on account of their offering spiritual sacrifices, so their consecration to such their priesthood was supposed to be performed in or by Baptism: or, in other words, their baptism was their consecration [u].

3. A third corollary is, that the Socinians, or others, who

[q] 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6.

[r] Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 386. Cp. Origen. in Levit. hom. ix. p. 236.

[s] Isidorus Pelusiot. lib. iii. ep. 75. p. 284.

[t] 'Cum omnes credentes N.T. sint sacerdotes respectu status spiritualis, et juris appropinquandi Deo in summo Pontifice Jesu; ministri verbi, dispensatores mysteriorum Dei, quatenus a Deo electi sunt, ut circa sacra publica versentur, respectu quodam oeconomico et externo, in externa Ecclesiae πολιτείᾳ fundato.' Hunc titulum sibi peculiari modo vindicant.' Vitringa in Isa. lxvi. 21. p. 951. Cp. Vitring. in Apocalyps. p. 335. N.B. This argument is discussed at large by Mr. Dodwell, De Jure Laico Sacerdotali, and by other tracts going along with his.

[u] Tertullian. de Monogam. cap. vii. p. 529. Origen. in Levit. hom. ix. 238. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xviii. cap. 33. p. 301. Ambrosiaster. de Sacram. lib. iv. cap. i. p. 365. ed. Bened.

reject both the sacrificial and federal view, do not only causelessly depreciate a venerable sacrament and sacrifice, but at the same time do the greatest disservice imaginable to practical religion. For as the sacrificial notion of the Eucharist, here explained, carries in it the most instructive and compendious lesson of Christian practice, so does the federal notion of the same carry in it the strongest engagements to bind us for ever to it. The removing these awakening hints, and the dissolving these sacred ties, under fair and smooth pretences of supporting practical Christianity, is betraying great want of judgment or want of sincerity; because there cannot be a more dangerous or more fatal way of subverting, by little and little, all true Christian morality.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Preparation proper for the Holy Communion.

IF we have hitherto gone upon sure grounds, with respect to the nature, ends, and uses of the holy Communion, there can be no doubt made, but that so sacred and so salutary an institution ought to be held in great reverence, and to be observed with all joy and thankfulness, tempered with godly fear. If we consider it either as a Divine ordinance coeval with Christianity, and perfective of it, or as a solemn memorial of God made man, or as an instrument whereby God vouchsafes to receive us, Christ to dwell in us, and the Holy Ghost to shed his blessed influences upon us; or if we consider it as the noblest part of Christian worship, the renewing of our covenant with God, the sacrificing of the heart, and the devoting of the affections, and all that we have, to his service, and to his glory; or if we further consider it as a badge of our most holy profession, and as a band or cement of union, whereby we abide in Christ, and have fellowship with all the family of heaven[x]; in which soever of these views we contemplate this holy ceremony, it must appear to be a matter of infinite concern to us, and highly deserving our most affectionate and devout regards. How we ought to express our esteem of it,

[x] Heb. xii. 22–24.

is the next thing to be inquired into: and the general rule here is, that we take care to do it in such a way, as may best answer those heavenly and salutary purposes for which this holy Sacrament was ordained. Our esteem or disesteem of it will be seen by our conduct; by our frequenting or not frequenting it, by our preparing or not preparing for it, as also by our manner of behaviour at the time of receiving, or after. My present concern is with the preparatory part. There is something of a preparation of heart, mind, and ways, required for all religious offices [y]; much more for this, which is the flower and perfection of all: and now the only remaining question is, what preparation is here requisite, or whereof it consists. The nature and ends of the institution, laid down above, will be our sure marks of direction, and cannot mislead us, if carefully attended to. Let us come to particulars.

1. Baptism, it is well known, must go before the Eucharist, like as Circumcision was previous to the Passover. A person must be admitted into covenant first, in order to renew; must be initiated, in order to be perfected; must be born into the Christian life, before he takes in the additional food proper to support and increase it. Of this there can be no dispute, and so I need not say much of it. There is an instance in antiquity, as high as the third century, of a person who had long been a communicant, and who afterwards found reason to doubt whether he had been validly baptized, and thereupon scrupled the coming again to the Lord's table. His bishop advised him, in that case, (considering how long he had been a communicant, and honestly all the time,) to go on without scruple; not presuming to give him Baptism, which now seemed to be superseded by the long and frequent use of this other Sacrament [z]. The case was very particular, and the resolution, probably, wise and just: both the scruple on one hand, and the determination on the other, (made with some

[y] Eccles. v. 1, 2. 1 Sam. vii. 3. 2 Chron. xxxv. 6.

[z] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 9. But Timothy, afterwards Bishop of the same see, (about A.D. 380,) determined, that if a catechumen ignorantly should happen to receive the Communion, he should forthwith be baptized, pursuant to such call of God. Timoth. Alexandr. Can. 1. Hard. p. 1192. tom. i.

hesitancy, and scarce satisfactory to the party,) shew how acknowledged a principal of the Church it then was, that Baptism is ordinarily a most essential part of the qualification required for receiving the holy Communion. Confirmation besides, is highly expedient[a], but Baptism is strictly necessary.

2. A competent knowledge of what the Communion means is another previous qualification. St. Paul teaches, that a person, coming to the Lord's table, should examine or approve himself, and that he should discern the Lord's body[b]: both which do suppose a competent knowledge of what the Sacrament means, and of what it requires[c]. And from thence may be drawn a very just and weighty argument against infant communion. But I return to the point in hand. As to the measure of the competent knowledge required for receiving the Communion, it must of course vary, according to the various opportunities, abilities, circumstances of the parties concerned; to be judged of by themselves, with the assistance of their proper guides. Great care was anciently taken in instructing the adults, called catechumens, in order to Baptism: something of like kind will be always proper, in such circumstances as ours, for the preparing persons for the first time of receiving the holy Communion.

3. A sound and right faith, as to the main substance of the Christian religion, is another previous qualification for this Sacrament. For whether we consider it as a renewal of our baptismal profession and covenant, which is engaging to observe the Gospel terms; or whether we consider it as an instrument of pardon and grace, and a pledge of the inheritance among the saints in light; sound faith must undoubtedly be required, to answer such ends and uses of it. Scripture has not directly said so, as there was no occasion for it; since the very nature of the thing, taking in Scripture principles, very fully and plainly declares it. Accordingly, we find, as early almost as we have any records left, that true and sound faith was very particularly

[a] See the Rubric at the end of our Order of Confirmation, and the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham, A. D. 1281. Spelm. Concil. tom. ii. p. 331.

[b] 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29.

[c] Ὀρθὸς βίος, ἅμα μαθήσει τῇ καθηκούσῃ. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 318.

required in those that came to the Lord's table[d]. Besides a right faith in the general, a particular belief with respect to the graces and benefits of a worthy reception of this Sacrament, was anciently, as well as reasonably, judged to be a previous qualification for it, requisite to render it salutary to the recipient. It would be tedious to produce authorities for it, and therefore I choose to refer the reader to the collections of that kind already made to our hands[e].

4. Above all things, repentance ought to be looked upon as a most essential qualification for a due reception of the holy Communion. All the ends and uses of the Sacrament declare it: the reason of the thing itself loudly proclaims it. For, without that, what is covenanting but playing the hypocrite? What is devoting ourselves to God at his table but lying and dissembling? How is it possible to hold communion at once with God and Baal, with Christ and Belial? Or how can the Spirit of God, and the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience, dwell together? It is plain therefore, that repentance, in some degree or other, and a heart turned to God, is essentially necessary to make the Sacrament salutary, yea, and to prevent its proving hurtful to the receiver.

If we look into the ancients, upon this head, we shall find them with united voice declaring, that repentance is absolutely necessary to make a worthy receiver. Justin Martyr specifies it among the previous qualifications, that the communicant shall be one who 'lives according as Christ has commanded[f].' Clemens, of the same century, intimates, that a good life[g] is requisite to a due receiving, and to prevent the receiving unworthily in St. Paul's sense; quoting 1 Cor. xi. 27, 28. Origen interprets the same words to mean, that the Sacrament must not be taken

[d] Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστι, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδαγμένα ὑπ' ἡμῶν. Just. Mart. p. 96. Hitherto belongs the noted proclamation anciently made by the Deacons, before the Communion began: Μή τις τῶν ἑτεροδόξων· Let no misbeliever come to the Lord's table. Vid. Apostol. Constitut. lib. viii. cap. 12. p. 403.

[e] Bingham, book xv. c. 8. s. 8.

[f] Οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. Justin. Apol. i. p. 96.

[g] Clemens Alex. Ὀρθὸς βίος, ἅμα μαθήσει τῇ καθηκούσῃ. Strom. i. p. 318.

with a 'soul defiled and polluted with sin[h].' St. Cyprian also more than once represents it as receiving unworthily, when a man comes to the Lord's table, before he has expiated his offences, confessed his crimes, purged his conscience, and appeased the anger of God[i]. All which shews, that he understood the text of St. Paul, not merely of the manner of behaviour at receiving, but of the previous qualifications of the receiver. In the same general way is the Apostle interpreted by the ancient commentators on that chapter[k]. But because some persons had made a distinction between being unworthy to receive, and receiving unworthily; to cut off all evasion sought for in that nicety, it was replied; that if the Apostle had restrained even the worthy from receiving unworthily, he had much more restrained every unworthy person from receiving at all; being that such a one is not capable of receiving worthily, while he continues such, that is, while he goes on in his vices[l]. There is scarce any one principle more universally agreed upon among the ancients, than this, that repentance and newness of life is a necessary preparation or qualification for the holy Communion, and is implied in worthy receiving.

It has been pleaded, in abatement, that the Apostle, by his caution against receiving unworthily, intended only to censure all irreverent behaviour at the table, and that the censure or

[h] 'Ne in anima contaminata et peccatis polluta Dominici corporis Sacramenta percipias. Quicunque enim manducaverit, inquit, panem, et biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit, &c. . . . Cibus iste sanctus non est communis omnium, nec cujuscunque indigni, sed sanctorum est.' Origen. in Lev. Hom. xiii. p. 257. Cp. in Matt. p. 254. ed. Huet.

[i] 'Contumacibus et pervicacibus comminatur et denuntiat, dicens: Quicunque ederit panem, aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Spretis his omnibus atque contemptis, ante expiata delicta, ante exomologesim factam criminis, ante purgatam conscientiam sacrificio et manu sacerdotis, ante offensam placatam indignantis Domini et minantis, vis infertur corpori ejus et sanguini,' &c. Cypr. de Laps. p. 186. Cp. pp. 19, 20, 141. edit. Bened.

[k] Chrysostom. in loc. p. 301, et de Poenit. Hom. vii. p. 326. tom. ii. ed. Bened. Theodoret, Oecumenius, Damascene, Theophylact, Pelagius inter Opp. Hieronym., Ambrosiaster, Cassiodorus complex, p. 37. Cp. Gregor. Nyssen. de Perfect. Christian. p. 718.

[l] 'Quidam sane dicunt, quia non indignum, sed indigne accipientem revocat a sancto. Si ergo etiam dignus indigne accedens retrahitur, quanto magis indignus, qui non potest accipere digne? Unde oportet otiosum cessare a vitiis, ut sanctum Domini corpus sancte percipiat.' Pelagius in loc.

admonition there given concerns rather the manner of receiving, than the previous qualifications of the receiver [m]. But to this pretext sufficient replies have been made by the more judicious [n]. I may briefly observe, 1. That if the Apostle had said nothing at all of unworthy receiving, yet the reason of the thing would shew, that the receiving of the Communion with dispositions repugnant to the end and use of it, is receiving unworthily, and offering an affront to its author. 2. That the Apostle's reproof to the Corinthians, in that chapter, was not levelled barely against an irreverent manner of receiving, but against the ill spirit and the unchristian temper, with which they came to the Lord's table: they were contentious, and full of animosities, split into factions and parties [o]; and from thence arose all their other disorders. Therefore the Apostle both began and concluded his admonition [p] with particular cautions against the spirit of division then reigning amongst them; a temper very improper for a feast of love and amity. 3. There is no reason for restraining the Apostle's general rules, laid down upon a special occasion, to that particular case only, especially when the reason of them extends equally to more. The Apostle says, Whosoever shall receive unworthily, &c., not confining what he says of it to this way or that. If it be receiving unworthily, in any ways whatever, his words are general enough to comprehend them all: and so are his other words; Let every one examine himself, and then eat, &c., and let him discern, discriminate, esteem, reverence the Lord's body. Therefore Chrysostom, upon the place [q], highly extols the wisdom of the Apostle, in making such excellent use of a particular case, as thereupon to lay down general rules for all cases of like nature, for the standing use of the Church in all times to come. Accordingly the judicious Theodoret takes notice, that the Apostle in verse the 27th, where he speaks of receiving un-

[m] See Mr. Locke on 1 Cor. xi. 28. Arth. Bury's Constant Communicant, p. 250, &c.

[n] Jenkins, Remarks on some Books, pp. 140–145. Le Clerc, Biblioth. Chois. tom. xiii. p. 96. Wolfius, Cur. Crit. in 1 Cor. xi. 28.

[o] 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. Compare 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

[p] 1 Cor. xi. 33, 34.

[q] Chrysostom in 1 Cor. xi. Hom. xxviii. p. 300, &c. Cp. Damascen. in loc. p. 102. Oecumenius, p. 532. Theophylact, p. 260.. Compare Jenkins, pp. 142, 143.

worthily, obliquely rebuked the ambitious, and the fornicators, and those also who had eaten of things offered unto idols; and in short, all that come to the Communion with a guilty conscience[r]. 4. Let it be considered, whether such as the Apostle forbids us to eat with[s], and whether those whom the Apostle censures as 'partakers of the table of devils[t],' and those whom he elsewhere describes as making one body with harlots[u], could be capable, while so abiding, of receiving worthily? If they could not, then the general rule of the Apostle, laid down in 1 Cor. xi. about receiving unworthily, must be understood to extend further than to the particular disorders which occasioned it. But if it be said, that such, so abiding, might notwithstanding receive worthily, then these absurdities will follow; that persons who are not fit for Christians to eat with, or who are communicants of devils; or who are incapable of being living members of Christ, or temples of the Holy Ghost, are yet capable of worthily receiving that symbolical body and blood of Christ, which are appointed to strengthen our union with him, and which suppose men to be living members of him, at their coming to receive.

Add to this, that St. Paul himself has elsewhere laid down a general rule, obliging all Christians to come clean to the Christian passover, drawn from the consideration of what was prescribed with respect to the Jewish one[x]. For if the feast there mentioned does not directly mean the eucharistical feast, but the whole Christian life considered as a feast of holiness; yet the reason there given will hold more strongly for those particular seasons when we are actually celebrating the memorial of 'Christ our passover Lamb,' as 'sacrificed for us.' For, as at all times, so then more especially, ought we to 'purge out the old leaven,' and to keep the sacred feast with the 'unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.'

Upon the whole, it must be allowed, that St. Paul's general rule will by parity of reason reach further than the particular cases there mentioned, and must be understood to exclude all impenitent offenders. This the Socinians themselves make no

[r] Theodoret in 1 Cor. xi. 27. [s] 1 Cor. v. 11. [t] 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.
[u] 1 Cor. vi. 15, 16. [x] 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

scruple to allow [y]; as indeed it is so clear a case, that there can be but very little room left for any reasonable dispute.

It remains still to be considered, what repentance really means, or wherein it consists. In the general, it means a new heart, or a serious resolution to amend what we find amiss, to the utmost of our power, and a deliberate intention to live a life of holiness [z] for the future; squaring our conduct, as near as human infirmities will permit, by the unerring rule of God's commandments. To be more particular, there are four principal articles, which the ancients, in this case, most insisted upon, as previous qualifications for receiving the holy Communion; I shall consider them one by one, but as briefly as may be.

1. One was, restitution or reparation for any wrongs done to others in their persons, estate, or good name, to the utmost of our ability [a]. This is but common justice, or moral honesty, and therefore must be looked upon as an essential article of amendment. It would lead me too far, to undertake here to state the exact rule or measures of it: those may be learned from sound casuists, who have professedly weighed and considered the subject [b]. In ordinary cases, an honest mind will not much need an instructor, but every well disposed person may be his own best casuist. All I shall hint is, that for public wrongs public satisfaction is most proper, as being perhaps the only one that can sufficiently repair the public injury: but for secret wrongs, the more secret the reparation is, so much the better, other circumstances being equal; because so the wrong is repaired, and at the same time ill blood prevented, future suspicions obviated, peace and amity secured.

To this head belongs what our Lord says; 'If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath

[y] Crellius, Ethic. Christian. lib. iii. c. 10. p. 354. Schlichting. in 1 Cor. xi. 28. p. 58. Przipcovius in loc.

[z] The ancient way was to proclaim before the service began, ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. Cyrill. Hierosol. Mystag. v. p. 331. A form occurring in all the old Liturgies, and which Chrysostom interprets to mean, Εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστὶν ἅγιος, μὴ προσίτω, If a man is not holy, let him not come near. In Hebr. Hom. xvii. p. 585. See also above, p. 263.

[a] See Bingham, b. xv. c. 8. sect. 10.

[b] Bishop Tillotson s Posth. Serm. cxvi. cxvii. p. 82 &c. fol. edit. Placete, Christian Casuist, or Treatise on Conscience, book i. chap. 20, 21, 22. Abridgment of Morality.

ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift[c].' The Lord's Supper was not instituted when these words were spoken: nevertheless they are applicable to it, in a view to the general reason on which the rule stands; and they have been often so applied both by ancients and moderns. Mr. Mede has well proved, that the precept is evangelical[d], though worded in Jewish terms, suited to the time wherein it was given. The disciples of our Lord (that is, believers at large, to whom that Divine sermon was directed[e]) were Jews and Christians both in one, and therefore could not be properly addressed in any language, but what might competently suit them in such their double capacity. The like was the case with respect to the Lord's Prayer, which though a Christian prayer, was yet formed in such general terms, as might indifferently serve a religious Jew, at the time when it was given. I say then, that the precept delivered by our Lord, about the great duty of reparation to be made to every injured brother, before we offer to God, though an evangelical precept, was yet so worded as to comport with the then present circumstances of the persons to whom it was directed. When circumstances came to be altered, the general reason still continued the same, and the application of it was easy and obvious to every capacity.

Irenaeus quotes the text, and adapts it to Christian circumstances in a very just and natural way. Gifts he interprets to mean Christian worship, alms, and oblations: and by altar he understands the high altar in heaven[f]. Tertullian, in like manner, accommodates it to the case of Christians coming to offer up their prayers to God; intimating, that they ought first to be at peace with their offended brethren, and to bring with them a forgiving temper, as they hoped to be forgiven[g]. Both parts are true: but the latter appears foreign with respect to this

[c] Matth. v. 23, 24.

[d] Mede, Disc. xlvi. p. 357, &c. edit. 1664. Compare Johnson's Propit. Oblat. p. 19, &c., and Lewis's Answer to Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 32.

[e] See Blair on the Sermon in the Mount, vol. i. serm. ii. iii. p. 27, &c.

[f] Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. pp. 250, 252. Cp. Pfaffius, pp. 57, 58.

[g] Tertullian. de Poenitent. cap. xii. p. 147; de Orat. cap. x. p. 133; et contr. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 9. p. 420.

text, which relates not to pardoning others who have injured us, but rather to the seeking pardon where we have injured. However, as the two parts are near allied, it was easy to blend ideas, and to run both into one; as several other Fathers did. Cyprian also accommodates the precept to Christian circumstances, interpreting the gift of prayers, which ought to be offered with a pacific temper of mind [h]. Elsewhere he applies it to the eucharistical prayers and services [i]. Eusebius and Cyril apply the text much in the same way [k]. And Origen interprets the gift to mean prayer [l]. The Constitutions called Apostolical interpret 'gift' of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, and the precept of entertaining no enmity against others, and taking what care we can that they may have no just ground of complaint against us [m]. Chrysostom accommodates the precept to the prayers and alms offered at the holy Communion, which would not be accepted, if not brought in charity, and with a peaceful mind [n]. In another Homily [o], he presses the point somewhat further, and says many good things of the care we ought to take to make up differences, if possible, even with those who without any just cause are our enemies; that so we may restore them, and heal their sores, and gain them over to good will. All which is right, if tempered with the rules of Christian prudence, and not strained so far, as to make well disposed and truly peaceable persons stay away from the Lord's table upon needless scruples; arising either from the irreconcilable temper of others, or from a want of due discernment of what is safe, prudent, or proper, under such or such circumstances. Improper or indiscreet overtures made by the offended party towards an offender, may often widen the breach which they mean to heal, and may increase the mischief, instead of curing it.

Jerome, upon the text, appears rather argute than solid; where he comments to this effect, if I understand him: 'It is

[h] Cyprian. de Oratione, p. 211.
[i] Cyprian. de Unit. Eccl. p. 198.
[k] Eusebius de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. cap. 41. Cyrill. Hierosol. Mystag. v. p. 326.
[l] Origen. de Orat. p. 198.
[m] Constitut. Apostol. lib. ii. cap. 53. p. 260.
[n] Chrysostom. in Matt. Hom. xvi. p. 217. ed. Bened. tom. vii.
[o] Chrysostom. de Simul. Hom. xx. p. 206, &c. tom. ii.

not said, if you take anything amiss of your brother, but if your brother takes anything amiss of you; to make the terms of reconciliation so much the harder. So long as we are not able to pacify the party, I know not whether we ought to offer our gifts unto God[p].' This is straining the point too far, if it means anything more than the using all safe, prudent, and reasonable endeavours to remove causeless offences, where a person is ignorant or froward.

St. Austin, who had a cooler head than Jerome, and was a more exact casuist, has given the justest and clearest account of this text that I have met with; perhaps with a design to take off such scruples as Jerome's account might have raised. As to the gift mentioned, he interprets it of prophecy, that is, doctrine, and prayers, and hymns, and the like spiritual services[q]. And as to the precept, he explains it thus: 'if we call to mind that our brother has ought against us; that is, if we have any way injured him; for then it is that he has something against us. But, if he has injured us, then we have something against him: in which case, there is no occasion to go to him for reconcilement. You would not ask pardon of the man that has done you an injury; it is sufficient that you forgive him, as you desire forgiveness at God's hands for what you have offended in. We are to go therefore to be reconciled, when it comes into our mind, that haply we may have some way injured our brother[r].' The sum then of all is, that if we are certain that we have done any man an injury in his person, estate, or good name, or that

[p] 'Non dixit, Si tu habes aliquid adversus fratrem tuum, sed, Si frater tuus habet aliquid adversum te; ut durior reconciliationis tibi imponatur necessitas. Quamdiu illum placare non possumus, nescio an consequenter munera nostra offeramus Deo.' Hieron. in loc. tom. iv. p. 16. edit. Bened.

[q] 'Quodlibet enim munus offerimus Deo, sive prophetiam, sive doctrinam, sive orationem, sive hymnum, sive psalmum, et si quid tale aliud spiritualium donorum animo occurrit,' &c. Augustin. de Serm. Domini in Mont. p. 167. edit. Bened. tom. iii.

[r] 'Si in mentem venerit, quod aliquid habeat adversum nos frater; id est, si nos eum in aliquo laesimus: tunc enim ipse habet adversum nos. Nam nos adversus illum habemus, si ille nos laesit: ubi non opus est pergere ad reconciliationem; non enim veniam postulabis ab eo qui tibi fecit injuriam, sed tantum dimittes, sicut tibi dimitti a Domino cupis, quod ipse commiseris. Pergendum est ergo ad reconciliationem, cum in mentem venerit, quod nos forte fratrem in aliquo laesimus.' Augustin. ibid.

we have given just cause of offence, it is our duty and business to make reparation, and to sue first for reconcilement: or if we are not certain, but probably suspect that we have been guilty that way, the same rule will still hold in proportion. But if we have good reason to judge that the person has really injured us, or has causelessly and captiously taken offence where none was given, then be it to himself: there is nothing in this text obliging an innocent person, in such a case, to make the first step towards reconcilement, or to suspend his offerings on any such scruple. There may, in some particular circumstances, be a kind of debt of charity, and Christian condescension, lying upon the injured party, to endeavour to reclaim and pacify the offender by soft and healing ways: but as that is a very nice affair, and the office such as many are not fit for, there lies no strict obligation in such a case, or at least not upon Christians at large, but upon those only who are peculiarly fitted for it. Therefore it falls not properly under the question now in hand, nor within the precept of the text, which is general, extending equally to all Christians. From the summary view here given of what the ancients thought of those words of our Lord, (besides the clearing an important case of conscience, which I chiefly aimed at,) it may be noted by the way, that the gift there mentioned was understood of spiritual sacrifice only, and the altar also of course must have been spiritual, while considered as an altar: which I take notice of as a confirmation of what hath been advanced in a preceding chapter. But I proceed.

2. As making restitution for any offences we have committed, is one necessary article of sacramental preparation, so is a readiness to forgive any offences committed against us another as necessary an article, and much insisted upon by the ancient churches [s]. This is a rule laid down by our blessed Lord in his Gospel, and made an express condition of our own forgiveness, and left us, for the greater caution, as an article of the Lord's Prayer to be daily repeated. All the difficulty lies in clearing and ascertaining the true and full meaning of the forgiveness

[s] See Bingham, xv. 8. 13.

required. Our Lord in one place says, 'If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him, and if he repent, forgive him;' and so again and again, as often as he repents, forgive [t]. May we then revenge ourselves upon an enemy, if he does not repent? No, by no means: vengeance is God's sole right [u]: man has nothing to do with it. Even magistrates, who, in some sense, are revengers, or avengers, to execute wrath [x], yet, strictly speaking, are not appointed to dispense vengeance. They do not, they cannot award punishments in just proportion to demerits, as God can do: but they are appointed to act for the safety of the State; and what they do is a kind of self-defence, in a public capacity, rather than a dispensing of vengeance. So that even they, properly speaking, are not commissioned to revenge: much less can any private persons justly claim any right to it. Forgiveness, if understood in opposition to revenge, is an unlimited duty, knows no bounds or measures, is not restrained to any kind or number of offences, nor to any condition of repenting: but all offences must be forgiven, in that sense, though not repented of, though ever so cruelly or so maliciously carried on and persisted in. Therefore the forgiveness which our Lord speaks of, as limited to the repentance of the party offending, can mean only the receiving a person into such a degree of friendship or intimacy, as he before had: a thing not safe, nor reasonable, unless he shews some tokens of sorrow for his fault, and some signs of a sincere intention to do so no more. Forgive him in such a sense, as to meditate no revenge, to wish him well, and to pray for him, and even to do him good in a way prudent and proper: but admit him not into confidence, nor trust yourself with him, till he repents: for that would be acting too far against the great law of self-preservation. Only take care, on the other hand, not to be over distrustful, nor to stand upon the utmost proofs of his relenting sincerity, but rather risk some relapses. This, I think, in the general, is a just account of Gospel-forgiveness [y].

[t] Luke xvii. 3, 4. Matt. xviii. 21, 22.

[u] Deut. xxxii. 35. Rom. xii. 19. Heb. x. 30.

[x] Rom. xiii. 4.

[y] Compare Abp. Tillotson, Serm. xxxiii. p. 392. vol. i. fol. edit. Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 298.

But to prevent all needless scruples, I may explain it a little further, in some distinct articles: 1. Gospel-forgiveness interferes not with proper discipline, nor the bringing offenders in a legal way to public justice. An informer may prosecute, a witness accuse, a jury bring in guilty, a judge condemn, and an executioner despatch a criminal, without any proper malevolence towards the party, but in great benevolence towards mankind. 2. Gospel-forgiveness interferes not with a person's prosecuting his own just rights, in a legal way, against one that has grievously injured him in his estate, person, or good name: for a man's barely doing himself justice, or recovering a right, is not taking revenge. A person wrongs me, perhaps, of a considerable sum: I forgive him the wrong, so as to bear him no malice; but I forgive him not the debt, because I am no way obliged to resign my own property or maintenance to an injurious invader. 3. Gospel-forgiveness interferes not with a just aversion to, or abhorrence of, some very ill men; liars, suppose, adulterers, fornicators, extortioners, impostors, blasphemers, or the like: for such hatred of aversion is a very different thing from hatred of malevolence, may be without it, and ought to be so. We cannot love monsters of iniquity with any love of complacency, neither does God delight in them as such: but still we may love them with a love of benevolence and compassion, as God also does[z]. 4. Neither does Gospel-forgiveness interfere with any proper degrees of love or esteem. A man may love his enemies in a just degree, and yet love his friends better, and one friend more than another, in proportion to their worth, or nearness, or other circumstances. Our Lord loved all his disciples, even Judas not excepted: but he loved one more particularly, who was therefore called 'the disciple whom Jesus loved[a];' and he loved the rest with distinction, and in proportionate degrees. 5. I have before hinted, that Gospel-forgiveness interferes not with rejecting enemies from our confidence, or refusing to admit them into our bosoms. We may wish them well, pray for them, and do them good; but still at a proper

[z] See Towerson on the Sacraments, pp. 298, 299.
[a] John xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xvi. 7, 20.

distance, such as a just regard for our own safety, or reasons of peace, piety, and charity may require. 6. I may add, that cases perhaps may be supposed, where even the duty of praying for them may be conceived to cease. 'There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it[b].' But in this case, they are not to be considered merely as private enemies, but as public nuisances, and as offending of malicious wickedness, not against man only, but against God and religion. Indeed, charity forbids us to pass such a censure, except it be upon very sure grounds; which perhaps we can but seldom, if ever, have: but I was willing to mention this case, for the better clearing up St. Paul's conduct in this very article. It may deserve our notice, that he prayed for those who had meanly, and through human infirmity, deserted him in the day of trial, that the sin might not be 'laid to their charge[c]:' in the same breath almost, speaking of Alexander, a wicked apostate, who had most maliciously opposed him and the Gospel, he says; 'The Lord reward him according to his works[d].' He would not honour him so far, as to pray for his conversion or forgiveness: or he knew his case to be too desperate to admit of either. Nevertheless, he left the vengeance entirely to God, whose right it was; and he took not upon him so much as to judge of the precise degree of his demerits, but committed that also to the unerring judgment of God. I am aware, that very considerable Divines, ancient and modern, choose to resolve the case another way, either into prediction by the Spirit, or into apostolical authority: but I humbly conceive, that there is no need of either supposition, to reconcile the seeming difficulty. Only, as I before hinted, an Apostle might better know the desperate state of such a person, than any one can ordinarily know at this day; and so he might proceed upon surer grounds: on which account, his example is not lightly to be imitated, or to be drawn into a precedent. Enough, I presume, has been here said of the nature, measure, and extent of Gospel-forgiveness, and I may now proceed to a new article of sacramental preparation.

[b] 1 John v. 16. [c] 2 Tim. iv. 16. [d] 2 Tim. iv. 14.

3. Another previous qualification, much insisted upon by the ancients[e], was a due regard to Church unity and public peace, in opposition to schism in the Church or faction in the State. The reason and the obligation of both is self-evident, and I need not enlarge upon it. It may be noted, that the Corinthians, whom St. Paul reproved, were much wanting in this article of preparation; as appeared by their heats and animosities, their sidings and contests. They did not duly consider this Sacrament as a symbol of peace, a feast of amity: they did not discern the Lord's body to be, what it really is, a cement of union, and a bond of true Christian membership, through the Spirit.

4. A fourth article was mercy and charity towards the poor brethren[f]. The equity of which is manifest: and it is a duty which has been so often and so well explained, both from the press and the pulpit, that I may here spare myself the trouble of saying a word more of it.

Having shewn, first, that repentance, at large, is a necessary part of sacramental preparation, and having shewn also of what particulars such repentance chiefly consists, (not excluding other particulars, for repentance means entire obedience,) I may now add, for the preventing groundless scruples, that allowances are always supposed for sins of infirmity, sins of daily incursion, such as are ordinarily consistent with a prevailing love of God and love of our neighbour. The slighter kind of offences ought never to be looked upon as any bar to our receiving, but rather as arguments for receiving, and that frequently, in order to gain ground of them more and more, and to have them washed off in the salutary blood of Christ.

As to the length of time to be taken up in preparing, there is no one certain rule to be given, which can suit all cases or circumstances: only, when a man has completely adjusted his accounts with God, (be it sooner, or be it later,) then is he fit to come, and not till then. There is an habitual, and there is an actual preparation. The habitual preparation is a good life; and the further we are advanced in it, the less need there is of any

[e] Bingham, xv. 8. 11.

[f] See Bingham, xv. 8. 12.

actual preparation besides: but because men are too apt to flatter and deceive their own hearts, and to speak peace to themselves without sufficient grounds for so doing; therefore some actual preparation, self-examination, &c. is generally necessary even to those who may be habitually good, if it be only to give them a well grounded assurance that they really are so. However, the better men are, the less actual preparation may suffice, and the shorter warning will be needful. Some therefore may receive as often as they have opportunity, though it were ever so sudden or unexpected; and they may turn it to good account by their pious care and recollection in their closets afterwards. Others may have a great deal to consider of beforehand, many offences to correct, many disorders to set right, much to do and much to undo, before they presume to come to God's altar.

Fault has been sometimes found with the little treatises of Weekly Preparation, and the like: I think without reason. They are exceeding useful in their kind; and even their number and variety is an advantage, considering that the tastes, tempers, necessities, capacities, and outward circumstances of Christians, are also manifold and various. It may be happy for them who need none of those helps: but they that least need them are not the men, generally, who most despise them. However, they are not obtruded as things absolutely necessary for all, but as highly useful to many, and especially upon their first receiving: though we are none of us perhaps so perfect, as not to want, at some seasons, some such hints for recollection, or helps to devotion. There may be excesses, or there may be defects in such treatises: what human compositions are without them? On the other hand, it should be considered, that there may be excesses and defects also in the censures or judgments passed upon them: for human frailties are as much seen to prevail in the work of judging and censuring, as in anything else whatsoever. In the general, it is well for common Christians, that they are so plentifully provided with useful manuals of that kind: they that are well disposed will make use of them as often as they need them, and will at all times give God thanks and praises for them.

I have said nothing, hitherto, about coming fasting to the Lord's table, neither need I say much now. The rule was early, and almost universal[g]; a rule of the Church, not a rule of Scripture, and so a matter of Christian liberty, rather than of strict command. They that use it as most expressive of Christian humility and reverence, or as an help to devotion, do well; and they that forbear it, either on account of infirmity, or for fear of being indisposed, and rendered less fit to attend the service, are not to be blamed. No one need be scrupulous concerning this matter: none should be censorious either way; either in rashly charging superstition on one hand, or in charging, as rashly, irreverence on the other. I shall only observe further, that it was a weak thing for so great a man as the justly celebrated Mabillon to draw an argument in favour of the corporal presence, from the custom of the Church in administering or receiving this holy Sacrament fasting[h]. For as the custom, probably, came in accidentally, either because, in times of persecution, Christians chose to communicate early in the morning for their greater safety, or because abuses had been committed in the previous love feasts; so was it continued for the like prudential reasons, and then only came to have different colours put upon it, when the reasons which first introduced it were, in a manner, forgotten and sunk. Besides, it was the ancient custom for both the administrator and receiver of Baptism, to come fasting, out of reverence to that Sacrament[i]: which further shews how slight the argument is, drawn from the custom of fasting before the Eucharist, as to proving anything of a corporal presence. If any man, duly considering how sacred those symbols of the Eucharist are, and to what high and holy purposes they were ordained, looks upon fasting as a proper token of the reverence he bears towards things sacred; he may as well fast upon that principle, as upon the imaginary notion of a corporal or local presence.

[g] Bingham, xv. 7. 8. Gaspar. Calvoer. Ritual. Eccles. vol. i. p. 413, &c. Sam. Basnag. Annal. tom. ii. p. 295, &c.

[h] Mabillon de Liturg. Gallican. lib. i. cap. 6. pp. 60, 61.

[i] Martene de Antiq. Eccl. Rit. tom. i. p. 25. The like rule was afterwards made for Confirmation.

I have nothing further to add, upon the head of sacramental preparation: but if any one desires to see this article more minutely drawn out, in its full length, he will not perhaps easily find a treatise better fitted to the purpose, than Bishop Taylor's Worthy Communicant [k]: to that therefore I refer the reader.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the Obligation to frequent Communion.

AS to frequency or constancy in receiving the Sacrament, it may be justly said in the general, abstracting from particular circumstances, that a man cannot too often commemorate our Lord and his passion, nor too often return devout thanks and praises for the same, nor too often repeat his resolutions of amendment, nor too often renew his solemn engagements, nor too often receive pardon of sins, and fresh succours of Divine grace: and if coming to the Lord's table (prepared or unprepared) were a sure and infallible way to answer those good and great ends, there could then be no question, but that it would be both our wisdom and our duty to communicate as often as opportunities should invite and health permit. But it is certain, on the other hand, that bare communicating is not the thing required, but communicating worthily. Here lies the main stress of all, not to urge frequency of communion so far as to render this holy Sacrament hurtful or fruitless to the parties concerned; neither yet to abate so far of the frequency, as to make a kind of dearth or famine of this so salutary and necessary food. Divines in all ages of the Church (unless we may except the first, and part of the second) have found some perplexity in settling a just mean between the extremes. I do not mean as to theory, or as to the thing considered in the general and in the abstract, but with respect to particular persons, cases, and circumstances; of which it is very difficult, if not impossible, to judge with unerring exactness. They determined perhaps as well and as wisely, upon the fairest presumptions and probabilities, as human sagacity in such dark cases could do: and

[k] Taylor's Worthy Communicant, chap. ii. iii. iv. v. vi. pp. 79—357.

if they sometimes ran into extremes, either on the right hand or on the left, their meaning all the while was good, and their conduct such as may reasonably claim all candid construction, and the best natured allowances. One thing is observable, (and I know not whether one can justly blame them for it), that, for the most part, they seemed inclinable to abate of frequency, rather than of the strictness of preparation or qualification. They considered, that due dispositions were absolutely necessary to make the Sacrament salutary, and were therefore chiefly to be looked to: and they supposed, with good reason, that God would more easily dispense with the want of the Sacrament than with the want of the qualifications proper for it. They thought further, that while a man was content to abstain from the Lord's table, out of an awful reverence for it, there was good probability that such a person would, by degrees, be perfectly reclaimed: but if once a man should set light by those holy solemnities, and irreverently rush upon them, without awe or concern, there could be very little hopes of his conversion or amendment; because he despised the most sacred bands of allegiance towards God, and looked upon them only as common forms[1]. Such were the prevailing sentiments of the ablest Divines and casuists in those ancient times; as will appear more fully, when I come to give a brief detail of their resolutions in this article, which I shall do presently.

But I may first take notice, for the clearer conception of the whole case, that, since it is allowed on all hands that there can be no just bar to frequency of Communion but the want of preparation, which is only such a bar as men may themselves remove if they please, it concerns them highly to take off the impediment, as soon as possible, and not to trust to vain hopes of alleviating one fault by another. It was required under the Law, that a man should come holy and clean, and well prepared[m] to the Passover: but yet his neglecting to be clean (when he might be clean) was never allowed as a just apology for his staying away. No: the absenting in that case was an offence great

[1] Vid. Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. ep. 364, p. 398, alias 345.

[m] 2 Chron. xxx. 1, &c.; xxxv. 3—6, &c.

enough to deserve the being cut off from God's people [n], because it amounted to a disesteeming, and, in effect, disowning God's covenant. The danger of misperforming any religious duty is an argument for fear and caution, but no excuse for neglect: God insists upon the doing it, and the doing it well also. The proper duty of the high priest, under the Law, was a very dangerous employ, requiring the exactest care and profoundest reverence [o]: nevertheless, there was no declining the service; neither was the exactness of the preparation or qualifications any proper excuse to be pleaded for non-performance. It was no sufficient plea for the slothful servant, under the Gospel, that he thought his Master hard to please, and thereupon neglected his bounden duty [p]: for the use he ought to have made of that thought was, to have been so much the more wakeful and diligent in his Master's service. Therefore, in the case of the holy Communion, it is to very little purpose to plead the strictness of the self-examination, or preparation, by way of excuse either for a total, or for a frequent, or for a long neglect of it. A man may say, that he comes not to the table, because he is not prepared, and so far he assigns a good reason: but if he should be further asked, why he is not prepared, when he may; there he can only make some trifling, insufficient excuse, or remain speechless.

But for the further clearing of this important article of frequent Communion, it may be proper to trace the judgment and practice of the churches of Christ from the beginning, and downwards through six or eight centuries; which I shall endeavour to do in as plain and few words as the nature of the subject will admit of.

Century the First.

In the days of the Apostles, Communions were frequent; either every day, or at least every Lord's day. Some have probably enough collected from the history of the Acts, that at Jerusalem, the mother church, there was a daily Communion [q], and that in

[n] Exod. xii. 15, 19. Num. ix. 13.
[o] Levit. xvi. 13. Cp. Deyling. Observ. Sacr. tom. ii. n. 41, p. 493; tom. iii. n. 46, p. 454, &c.
[p] Matt. xxv. 24, &c. Luke xix. 20, &c.
[q] Acts ii. 42, 46.

other churches the custom was to have weekly Communions at least, that is to say, upon the Lord's day [r]. But all must be understood of persons fitly prepared, to appearance at least: for it is certain, that open fornicators, extortioners, idolaters, and the like, were not admitted to Communion. Christians were not allowed to keep company with such delinquents, no not to eat common meals [s]; much less to communicate. St. Paul gave orders for excommunicating the incestuous Corinthian [t]; and he admitted him not again, till after a very serious and solemn repentance, after his being almost swallowed up of grief [u]. However, it is observable, that both his exclusion and his readmission were within the compass of a twelvemonth: for St. Paul's two Epistles to Corinth are judged to bear date the same year, namely, A. D. 57. Such are the apostolical precedents for frequent Communion if prepared, and for abstaining if not prepared.

Century the Second.

In the next century we have undoubted evidences of weekly Communions, and particularly on the Lord's day. This is justly collected from the testimony of the younger Pliny above cited [x], and is plainly declared by Justin Martyr [y], of the same century. None but true believers and men of good lives were permitted to receive, as I before observed [z] from the same excellent writer: so that frequency of communicating was never urged in derogation of the preparatory requisites, or to make any abatement in them. As to public and scandalous offences, in faith or manners, those the Church could see, and provide against, by debarring the offenders from Communion: and as to secret impediments, they took what care they could, by permitting or exhorting such as might be conscious of their own unfitness, to forbear coming to the altar. There is a remarkable passage to this purpose, in a learned writer of the second century, which runs thus: 'Some, after the customary division of the elements, leave it upon the

[r] Acts xx. 7.
[s] 1 Cor. v. 11, 12. Cp. 2 John 10.
[t] 1 Cor. v. 5, 13.
[u] 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7.
[x] See above, chap. i. p. 26.
[y] Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, κ.τ.λ. Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 97.
[z] See above, chap. xiii. p. 354.

consciences of their people, either to take their part, or otherwise. For the best rule to determine them in their participation or forbearance, is their own conscience: and the surest foundation for conscience to proceed upon is a good life, joined with a competent measure of proficiency in Christian knowledge. And the best method of coming at the knowledge of the truth, and a right performance of what is commanded, is to choose for your direction persons of most approved faith and conduct. For whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord: but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup[a].' Thus far Clemens. And from thence we may observe, that there was yet no standing rule or Canon of the Church, obliging all the faithful to receive as often as they met for Divine Service; but Christians were left at liberty to judge how far they were fitly qualified in knowledge, or in godly living: only, it was supposed, that they ought to be fitly qualified; and if they were, to receive.

Tertullian, who lived in the close of the same century, takes notice of some who declined receiving, upon the stationary days, (Wednesdays and Fridays), for fear of breaking their fast[b]. He blames them for their foolish scruple, and suggests to them a better way, whereby they might keep both their fast and their feast. I may observe from it, that he thought it a duty incumbent upon all the faithful, to communicate as often as they might; but the Church had not yet enforced the duty with any Canons, obliging them under pain of ecclesiastical censure to receive: for, had that been the case, Tertullian probably would have mentioned it; or rather, there would scarce have been room left either for their scruples on one hand, or for his charitable advice on the other. However, from hence perhaps we may date the first beginnings of that coldness and backwardness in point of frequent Communion, which grew up apace amongst Christians afterwards: it is not certain that those persons were sincere in their pretended scruples; but they might be willing to shift off the duty as decently as they could, under the fairest colours.

[a] Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 318. [b] Tertullian. de Orat. cap. xiv. p. 136.

Century the Third.

St. Cyprian, who flourished about the middle of the third century, mentions daily Communions, as the common practice of that time[c]: and he everywhere speaks highly of the use and benefit of the Sacrament to the worthy receivers: but no man could be more careful to prevent any one's coming to the Lord's table, who had committed any of the grievous sins, and had not yet made full satisfaction to God and the world, by a strict and solemn repentance.

In this century crept in some superstitious or overcurious conceits about legal defilements[d], as a bar to Communion, or even to coming to the Christian assemblies. Such niceties, while they carried a show of reverence for holy places and things, might notwithstanding have better been let alone; having no warrant in the Gospel of Christ, nor in the practice of the earlier ages of the Church, so far as appears: neither indeed were they altogether consistent with the ancient custom of daily Communions of all the faithful, which had obtained in some churches. One thing is observable, that during the first three centuries, we meet with no Canons made to enforce frequent Communion, scarce so much as exhortations to it, or any complaints of neglect in that article: which is an argument that Christians in those times were not tardy in that respect, but rather forward and pressing, under an high notion of the privilege and comfort of partaking of the holy Communion. Therefore the chief care and concern of Church guides, during the first ages, was rather to inculcate the necessity of due preparation, than to insist upon frequency, for which there was less occasion. But times and circumstances soon came to be altered; as we shall see presently, upon taking a view of the following centuries.

Century the Fourth.

In the year 305 (some say, 300, or 303, or 313, or 324) was held a council of nineteen Bishops, at Eliberis, or Elvira, in

[c] See the whole passage above, chap. vi. p. 110.

[d] Vid. Canones Dionys. Alexandrin. Harduin. tom. i. p. 187, &c. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 4, &c.

Andalusia, a province of Spain. Among many other Canons, a rule was then made, not to accept of an offering from one who did not communicate [e]. We may judge from hence, that Christians now began to be remiss, with respect to Communion, and that such Canon was intended for a gentle rebuke to them; a mark of public disfavour, in order to excite and quicken them, first to prepare, and then to receive. Many perhaps might now grow cold and careless as to coming to the Lord's table; either because they had not a just sense of the use and benefit of it, and of the obligations they were under to it; or they loved the world too well, and were willing to put off their repentance from day to day, and so of course to stave off that solemn profession which the holy Sacrament required. The like coldness and backwardness appeared in many of that age, even with respect to Baptism [f]: for, while they were well-wishers to it, and stood candidates for it, they yet loved to procrastinate and to feign excuses; because delaying Baptism was delaying repentance, which depraved nature was prone enough to do. The case, very probably, was much the same with respect to this other Sacrament: and hence arose that coldness towards it, which the Church guides of those times were much concerned at, and endeavoured gently to remove.

When those milder applications did not sufficiently answer, some brisker methods were thought on for the compassing the same good end. In the year 341, a Council of Antioch decreed, That all they who came to Church, and heard the holy Scriptures read, and afterwards joined not in prayer with the people, or turned their backs on the holy Communion, after a disorderly way, should be cast out of the Church, till such time as they should make public confession of their fault, and give proofs of their repentance, and humbly sue to be reconciled [g].' This rule

[e] 'Episcopos placuit ab eo, qui non communicat, munera accipere non debere.' Concil. Illiberit. Can. xxviii. Harduin. 153.

[f] Vid. Basil. Homil. in Sanct. Bapt. p. 114, &c. edit. Bened. tom. ii. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. xl. p. 647, &c. Constit. Apostol. lib. vi. cap. 15. Gregor. Nyssen. de Baptism. Opp. tom. iii. p. 216, &c. Compare Bingham, xi. 6, 2, 3, &c.

[g] *Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δὲ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποτρεπομένους τὴν ἁγίαν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας, κατά τινα ἀταξίαν, τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἕως ἂν ἐξομολογησά-*

may seem to be a severe rule, on more accounts than one. 1. As it appears to run in general terms, making no express exceptions for those who, for just causes, best known to themselves, might sometimes decline receiving. 2. Supposing any person to absent from the Lord's table, out of reverence to it, (being conscious to himself of some secret offences,) as it was a rule of the Church to excommunicate no man but for open and scandalous sins, it might look hard to excommunicate merely for not receiving constantly; because it was, in effect, extending discipline even to the most private and concealed offences, or to other impediments. 3. Since no one ought to receive but he that sincerely repents; and since repentance must be free, or it is really no repentance; it appears not right to excommunicate a man, in order to oblige him to receive, unless it were right also to excommunicate every one who should delay repentance, or who would not instantly be persuaded to reform, so far as to be capable of receiving worthily the holy Communion. This appears not to have been the rule of the earlier centuries: for they left men at liberty to judge (except in cases of open scandal) how far they were worthy or otherwise, and thereupon to choose either to receive or forbear. These or the like reasons, I presume, have put learned men upon softening explications, to mitigate the rigour of the Canon. Emanuel Schelstrate has suggested, that the order then made pointed chiefly at the Audians, or Quarto-decimans[h], who held private conventicles, but came occasionally to Church, to hear the Scriptures read, and sermons preached, and then departed, in a disorderly and scornful manner, upon some erroneous principles of their sect, to the great scandal and offence of the more serious and sober part of the congregation. Schelstrate's account is favoured by two circumstances: one, that the Canon immediately preceding most plainly strikes at the Quarto-decimans, though without naming them; and the other, that the Canon does not simply and absolutely censure all non-communicants, but some only, with this restriction, as doing it *κατά τινα ἀταξίαν*, which

μενοι καὶ δείξαντες καρποὺς μετανοίας, καὶ παρακαλέσαντες τυχεῖν δυναθῶσι συγγνώμης. Concil. Antioch. Can. ii. Bevereg. Pand. p. 431.

[h] Vid. Schelstrate de Concilio Antiochen. pp. 179, 222.

Dionysius Exiguus renders 'pro quadam intemperantia,' *with a certain rudeness;* and Isidorus Mercator renders 'secundum aliquam propriam disciplinam,' *according to the principles of their own sect.* Now, if such was the case, then the rigour of the Canon affected not the main body of the faithful, adhering to the Church, who might be still left to the same discretionary conscientious liberty as before.

Perhaps the like account may serve for the Apostolical Canons also, so far as concerns this article: Schelstrate was of that mind, and applied the same solution to both[i]. One of the Apostolical Canons orders, 'That if any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or any of the sacerdotal college, does not communicate when there is a Communion, [oblation,] he shall be obliged to assign a reason; and if it be a just one, he shall be excused: otherwise he shall be suspended, as giving offence to the people, and as raising a suspicion upon the administrator, as if he did not salutarily execute his office[k].' The last words put me in mind of the fourth Canon of the Council of Gangra, held a few years before the Antiochian: some place it in 324, some in 330; all agree that it was not later than 340. That Canon decrees, 'That if any one takes exception to a married Presbyter, as such, thinking it not lawful to receive the Communion at his hands, let him be anathema[l].' Whether the Antiochian and Apostolical Canons might not have some view to that case, in what they decreed against any one's turning his back on the Communion, I leave to the learned to consider.

The next Canon called Apostolical makes a like order with respect to the laity, as the former had done with regard to the clergy: viz. 'That as many of the faithful as came to Church, and did not abide all the time of the prayer and Communion,

[i] Schelstrate, ibid. p. 222.

[k] Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ, προσφορᾶς γενομένης, μὴ μεταλάβοι, τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπάτω· καὶ ἐὰν εὔλογος ᾖ, συγγνώμης τυγχανέτω· εἰ δὲ μὴ λέγῃ, ἀφοριζέσθω, ὡς αἴτιος βλάβης γενηθεὶς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ ὑπόνοιαν ἐμποιήσας κατὰ τοῦ προσενέγκαντος, ὡς μὴ ὑγιῶς ἀνενέγκαντος. Can. Apostol. vi, alias viii.

[l] Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο περὶ πρεσβυτέρου γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι, λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ, προσφορᾶς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Concil. Gangrens. Can. iv. Hard. p. 530. Bevereg. Pand. tom. i. 419.

should be excommunicated, as guilty of raising disturbance in the Church[m].' It is hard to judge certainly of the particular drift or purport of such Canons, without a more explicit knowledge of the then present circumstances: but it is not likely that they were ever intended to oblige all the faithful to communicate as often as they came to Divine Service, or to abridge them of the reasonable liberty of judging how far they were prepared for it, and whether they might not sometimes (provided it were not customary, so as to amount to contempt) abstain from it. Balsamon, in his Notes upon the Apostolical Canon last cited, calls it a very harsh decree[n]: and so indeed it is, if interpreted with utmost rigour. But he intimates elsewhere, that the Greek Church in his time received it with a softening explication[o]. Schelstrate, as before noted, has suggested another; and to both I have taken the liberty to subjoin a third. It is not reasonable to think, that a modest and sober departure, before Communion began, (a practice now common, and, I believe, always in use, more or less,) could be looked upon as a disturbance: but if it was done out of dislike, or contempt, and upon factious principles, then indeed it would be apt to make great disturbance; and that, very probably, was what the compilers of those Canons were solicitous to prevent or remedy. But I return.

I proceed in reciting the principles of the fourth century, with regard to frequent Communion. Basil (about the year 372) being consulted on this head, declares it good and profitable to communicate every day; testifying withal, of the practice of the church of Caesarea, where he was, that they celebrated the Sacrament four times a week, (on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday,) besides the saints' days, [festivals of martyrs,] as often as they occurred[p]: but he does not say how diligent or how constant the people were in attending upon it.

[m] Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας πιστοὺς εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραμένοντας δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ μεταλήψει, ὡς ἀταξίαν ἐμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή. Can. Apostol. vii. alias ix.

[n] Διορισμὸς δριμύτατός ἐστιν. Balsam. in loc.

[o] Vid. Beveregii Annot. in Apost. Can. ix. p. 21.

[p] Basil. Epist. xciii. (alias cclxxxix.) p. 186, ed. Bened. tom. iii. Cp. Socrat. Eccles. Histor. lib. v. cap. 22.

Chrysostom, of the same century, somewhat later, will give us the best light, both with respect to the practice of that age, and the rules whereby it was conducted. In one place of his works, he speaks thus: 'Many partake of this sacrifice once a year, some twice, some oftener.—Which of them should we most approve of? Those that communicate once, or those that do it often, or those that seldom do it? Neither the once-comers, nor the often, nor the seldom, but those that come with a clean conscience, a pure heart, and a life unblamable, they that are so qualified should come constantly: but as to them that are not, once is too much for them. And why so? Because they will only receive to themselves judgment and condemnation, pains and penalties[q].' Here we may observe how this good Father pressed upon his hearers the duty of constant Communion, but under caution of coming fitly prepared: otherwise he thought it would not be barely fruitless, but hurtful. That was the standing rule of the Church, the settled principle which they constantly went upon, with respect to both Sacraments. For, whatever high notions they might entertain of the use or necessity of Baptism, yet they never would encourage any person to receive it, before they believed him well qualified for it; but would sometimes keep the catechumens back, for five, or ten, or twenty years, or even to the hour of death, rather than admit them in a state of impenitence, or before they had been well disciplined and proved[r]. Sacraments were a good superstructure: but the foundation was first and principally to be looked to, the foundation of repentance and a good life. Qualifications ought to go before admission: and service before privileges. But I pass on.

Chrysostom, in another Homily, reproves the non-communicants, and presses frequent Communion in the manner here following: 'In vain stand we at the altar, none come to receive. I speak not barely to persuade you to receive, but to make yourselves worthy. You are not worthy [you will say] of the sacrifice, or not fit to receive? Then neither are you worthy of the prayer: do you not hear the Deacon, when he stands up

[q] Chrysostom. in Heb. Hom. xvii. p. 856, edit. Paris.

[r] See Testimonies referred to in Bingham, xi. 6. 1.

and proclaims, As many among you as are under penance, withdraw? All that do not communicate, are supposed to be under penance. If you are of the number of penitents, you must not receive: for he that does not receive is under penance. Why does he [the Deacon] say, All ye that cannot pray, depart? And why do you, after that, impudently stay? You are not one of those, you will say, but of those who may receive. Have you then no regard for that, or do you think it a slight privilege? Consider, I beseech you, &c.—Every one that does not partake of the mysteries, is shameless and impudent to stand by all the while.—You sing the hymn with the rest, and you profess yourself one of the worthy, by your not departing with the unworthy. With what face then can you presume to stay, and yet not partake of the table? You plead, you are unworthy: you are therefore unworthy to join in the prayers, for the Holy Spirit descends, not only in the offering of the elements, but also in the chanting of the hymns[s].' Chrysostom here pleads for frequent Communion, in a strong affecting way, but still loses not sight of the main point, which was the receiving worthily.

The argument he draws from prayer to Communion has been sometimes misunderstood, and may here deserve to be set right. He does not mean that prayer in general requires the same preparation that the Communion does, or that every one who may properly be admitted to the former may as properly be admitted to the latter also. No: that would run directly counter to the known principles and practice, and standing discipline of

[s] Chrysost. in Ephes. Hom. iii. pp. 887, 888.

N.B. The Communion hymns are by Goar (Euchol. p. 136) distinguished into four:

1. "Υμνος ἀγγελικός. The angelical. 'Glory to God on high,' &c.

2. "Υμνος χερουβικός. The cherubical hymn, in Goar, p. 206.

3. "Υμνος τρισάγιος. Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, &c.

4. "Υμνος ἐπινίκιος. The triumphal hymn. 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord,' &c. Isa. vi. 3.

But the first and fourth are the most ancient: the second and third are both later than Chrysostom. The three last are but one trisagium in the main, one cherubical, or seraphical hymn, with some variations, additions, and interpolations made at different times. See Bingham, xiv. 2, 3; xv. 3, 9, 10. Allix. Dissert. de Trisagii Origine. Renaudot. Liturg. Collect. tom. i. p. 228. tom. ii. p. 69.

the Church in that age: for nothing was more usual than to admit penitents of the fourth order, to communion in prayers, for two, three, four, or sometimes five years, and all the while to debar them from the holy Communion, as not yet worthy to be admitted to it [t]. But what Chrysostom meant was, that it was very absurd, and even downright impudent, for a man to claim a right to stand by, all the while that the Communion was administering, and to join in those most sacred and mystical prayers and hymns, which were proper to it, and at the same time to pretend that he was not worthy of it: for, if he really was not worthy to receive, he was not worthy to be present during that holy solemnity, or to bear a part in the prayers which peculiarly belonged to it. I know, it has been thought by persons of good learning, that the fourth order of penitents (called *συνιστάμενοι*, consistentes, in English co-standers, or associates) were allowed to be present during the whole solemnity, while prohibited from receiving, and that Sunday after Sunday, for several years together: which would have been committing that very absurdity which Chrysostom here so strongly remonstrates against. But I take that prevailing notion to be all a mistake, owing to the want of a right understanding the ancient Canons and ancient phrases. Those co-standers were allowed to communicate in prayers with the faithful [u]. What prayers, is the question. I suppose the prayers previous to the holy kiss, previous also to the oblation; which were indeed part of the Missa fidelium, or Communion Service, (like to our prayer for the Church militant,) but were not the proper mystical prayers belonging to the Communion, and of which Chrysostom is to be understood. The co-standers, being the highest order of penitents, had the

[t] Concil. Ancyran, Can. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 24. Concil. Nicen. Can. 11, 12, 13. Basil. Can. 22, 30, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 66, 75, 82, 83. Concil. Carthag. vi. Can. 11. Concil. Trull. Can. 87.

[u] *Εὐχῆς δὲ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι.* Concil. Ancyr. Can. iv. *Κοινωνῆσαι χωρὶς προσφορᾶς.* Ibid. Can. vi. So in the Nicene Canons, and Basil's, &c.

All that did not depart with the catechumens, after the Gospel, or with the penitents soon after, communicated in prayer, as appears by the Apostolical Constitutions. *Μὴ κοινωνείτωσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, ἀλλ' ἐξερχέσθωσαν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.* lib. ii. cap. 39. The Council of Laodicea distinctly mentions what prayers preceded the oblation. Can. xix. p. 786, Harduin.

privilege to stand in the same place of the Church with the faithful, and to abide there, after the catechumens and lower penitents were dismissed; and they were permitted to communicate in prayer, till the oblation began, and then they also were to withdraw. This I collect, as from several other circumstances, so particularly from hence, that the Deacons just before the salutation of peace, warned all non-communicants to withdraw[x]. The co-standers must of course have been reckoned of that number, being forbid to communicate; and therefore they must have been obliged to withdraw after the preparatory prayers, and before the Communion, properly speaking, began. Chrysostom himself intimates in another Homily, that all non-communicants were warned to depart[y]; and that presently after came on the mystical hymn. About that time the co-standers, as I conceive, withdrew. Neither, indeed, is it credible, that so knowing a person as Chrysostom would have represented it as a flaming absurdity for a non-communicant to be present during the whole solemnity, had the custom of the Church allowed it in the co-standers, who were non-communicants.

It may be objected, that Pope Siricius (about A. D. 385) allowed or ordered some non-communicants to abide till the whole service was over[z]: and Sozomen speaks of the custom of the western churches, as obliging the penitents to wait all the time of the Communion Service, in order to receive the Bishop's absolution after it was ended[a]. These are the principal passages which have led learned men into a persuasion, that the co-standers were used to be present during the whole solemnity. But they

[x] Ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἀναφορᾷ ὁ διάκονος προσφωνεῖ πρὸ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ· οἱ ἀκοινώνητοι περιπατήσατε. Timoth. Alex. Resp. ix. 1104, Hard. Οἱ τὴν πρώτην εὐχὴν εὐχόμενοι, προέλθετε. Apost. Constitut. lib. viii. cap. 12. 'Si quis non communicat, det locum.' Gregor. M. Dial. lib. ii. cap. 23.

[y] Μή τις τῶν κατηχουμένων, μή τις τῶν μὴ ἐσθιόντων, μή τις τῶν κατασκόπων, μή τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων θεάσασθαι τὸν μόσχον ἐσθιόμενον . . . μή τις ἀνάξιος τῆς ζώσης θυσίας, &c. Chrysost. Homil. de Fil. Prod. tom. vi. p. 375, Paris.

[z] 'Diximus decernendum, ut sola intra ecclesiam fidelibus oratione jungantur; Sacris mysteriorum celebritatibus, quamvis non mereantur, intersint; a Dominicae autem mensae convivio segregentur,' &c. Siric. Epist. p. 848, Harduin.

[a] Πληρωθείσης τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργίας. Sozom. lib. vii. cap. 16, p. 300, edit. Cant.

did not observe, that the preparatory service was called the service, or the mass, and that the Communion, properly, began not till that service was ended, and the non-communicants were withdrawn. Gregory Turonensis, of the sixth century, may help to clear this matter: he speaks of the Communion's beginning after the masses or liturgies were ended [b]. Cyprian, long before, spake much after the same way [c]. And even Justin Martyr has made mention of the common prayers, as ended, before the Communion began, before the holy salutation: and soon after he takes notice of the subsequent prayers and thanksgivings proper to the Communion [d]. Those subsequent prayers were what Chrysostom spake of, as altogether improper for any to join in, or to be present at, except the communicants themselves.

A learned writer of our own observes, that 'what in Chrysostom's time was reckoned a crime, was presently after accounted a piece of devotion, for the people to stay and hear the whole solemnity of the service, till the time of communicating, and then they might depart without partaking of the Communion: which was plainly a relaxation of the ancient discipline, and a deviation from the primitive practice [e].' For this he refers to the Council of Agde of the year 506, and to the first Council of Orleans in 511. I take not upon me to defend what was done in later times, but to clear Chrysostom's argument, as consonant to the principles and practice of that age with respect to non-communicants, whether co-standers or others. However, I must observe, with respect even to the Councils of Agde and Orleans, that no order was made for non-communicants to stay during the whole solemnity of the Communion: only, they

[b] 'Ubi peractis solemnibus, ad sacrosanctum altarium communicandi gratia accessisset,' &c. Gregor. Turon, lib. ix. n. 3, p. 419.

'Cumque expletis missis, populus coepisset sacrosanctum corpus Redemptoris accipere.' Greg. Turon. de Mirac. Mattin. lib. ii. cap. 47, p. 1060. Cp. Mabillon de Liturg. Gallican. pp. 35, 36, 51.

[c] 'Ubi vero solennibus adimpletis, calicem diaconus offerre praesentibus coepit,' &c. Cyprian. de Laps. p. 132, edit. Oxon.

[d] Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα, παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν· ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος, καὶ κράματος. Καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει. Justin. Mart. Apol. i. pp. 95, 96, edit. Thirlb.

[e] Bingham, xv. 4, 2.

were obliged to wait for the Bishop's benediction, (which was previous[f] to the most solemn part of the service,) and then to depart. So that though the dismission of the non-communicants might perhaps be deferred somewhat later now, than in Chrysostom's time, yet dismissed they were before the Communion properly came on; and the absurdity which Chrysostom complained of, that of staying out the whole solemnity without communicating, never was admitted in those days.

The principal use I had in view, by what I have here said, was to take off a kind of popular plea, which has been sometimes urged in the name of Chrysostom, that every one who may be admitted to prayers, ought to be admitted to Communion also; and that there is no more reason for absenting from the Communion, on account of unfitness, than there is for absenting from prayers on the like account: for it is pleaded, that either a man is fit for both or for neither. Chrysostom never said, or most certainly never meant any such thing: so that his authority ought to be out of the question. As to the reason of the case, the plea can never hold upon that foot. It is true, prayer requires some preparation; and a man may pray unworthily, as well as communicate unworthily: and his prayer, in such circumstances, may be vain and fruitless[g]. But yet it is nowhere said, that he who prays unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, or that he shall draw down judgment upon himself by doing it. Neither is all prayer so sacred and solemn as sacramental prayer, nor is any mere prayer a federal rite, like a Sacrament: nor does the want of due preparation in prayer (though a culpable neglect) so directly tend to frustrate the most sacred ties, and to turn all religion into hypocrisy and form, as the want of it in the other case does: therefore, the two cases are by no means parallel, but similar only, and that in great disproportion. And hence it was (as I before hinted) that the ancients, while they admitted catechumens to some prayers, proper to them, and the lower degrees of penitents to prayers proper

[f] Vid. Bona de Reb. Liturg. lib. ii. cap. 16, n. 1, 2, p. 664, &c. Mabillon de Liturg. Gallic. lib. i. cap. 4, n. 14, p. 35. Calvoer. Ritual. Ecclesiast. vol. i. p. 713. Bingham, xv. 3, 28, 29.

[g] Prov. xv. 8. Isa. i. 15.

for them, and the highest order of penitents to some part of the Communion prayers, as not improper for them; yet they debarred even the best of them, sometimes, month after month, or year after year, as not yet worthy to receive the holy Communion.

I may now proceed somewhat further with Chrysostom. In another Homily, after he had been speaking of the danger of receiving unworthily, he adds, 'I speak not this to deter you from coming, but from coming carelessly. For, as there is danger in coming carelessly, so there is famine and death in the not partaking at all of the mystical supper. This table is, as it were, the sinews of our souls, the girding up of the mind, the support of our confidence; our hope, our health, our light, our life[h].' Here the eloquent Father seems to make it not so bad to receive unworthily, as to forbear receiving at all: for he represents the one as dangerous, the other as fatal. If so, the unworthy non-communicant would be in a worse condition than the unworthy communicant; and it would be safest to receive at all adventures: and if that were admitted, it would be hard to justify the ancient discipline with respect to either Sacrament. But here we must answer with distinction. Supposing the unworthiness equal in both, there is equally contempt in both cases, but not equal contempt; for the unworthy communicant is guilty of a greater contempt than the other, and is the most profane of the two, incurring greater damnation. As it were better not to have known the way of life, than to go counter to it[i]; so it were better never to take the Sacrament, than to profane it as constantly as we take it. So then, to neglect it out of contempt is indeed famine and death: but still the other is more dangerous, as exposing the person to sorer death and more grievous punishment; which I take to be Chrysostom's real meaning. Nevertheless, if a man only suspects or doubts within himself, whether he is fit to receive, it will certainly be his safest way to receive; and his humble modesty, if really such, will itself be a commendable part of his preparation[k]. The degrees of unworthiness are many and various, and no man is strictly worthy: a sincere,

[h] Chrysostom in 1 Cor. x. Hom. xxv. p. 262.

[i] 2 Pet. ii. 21.

[k] See Luke xviii. 13, 14.

though for the present weak resolution to amend instantly in every known article of disobedience, seems to be ordinarily a sufficient security against the danger of receiving unworthily.

Century the Fifth.

The first Council of Toledo, in the year 400, made an order about those who were observed never to come to Communion, that they should be admonished for such their habitual and total neglect, and if they did not reform, should be obliged to submit to penance[1]. This decree appears very mild and moderate, as being pointed only against those who constantly absented, and as prescribing an admonition before the censure; and at length excommunicating those only, who had in a measure excommunicated themselves. No doubt but such order might have a very good effect upon those who were barely supine and careless in that article, otherwise leading innocent lives. But perhaps exhortation or admonition alone might have been sufficient to as many as were well disposed; and as to the rest, censure might be thought too much: for who shall force a man to repent? Or how is it repentance, if it is not free? Or what signifies the coming to the Lord's table in hypocrisy? These considerations have their weight: and therefore excommunication in such a case, so far as it is justifiable, must be maintained upon some general principle, such as the necessity of removing notorious offences or scandals, for fear of contagion to the rest, and for fear of bringing an infamy upon the whole body, by such connivance as might look too like an allowance of so shameful a neglect. The general good of the Church, in some cases, ought to overrule all such considerations as have been before mentioned. For example: there are, suppose, ten thousand officiating clergy in a nation, who may be obliged, by the laws of Church and State, to administer and to receive the holy Communion, so often, be they prepared or otherwise. In such a number, some hundreds, it may be, may officiate and receive, not duly prepared. Let them

[1] 'De his qui intrant in ecclesiam, et deprehenduntur nunquam communicare, admoneantur, ut, si non communicant, ad poenitentiam accedant,' &c. Concil. Tolet. i. Can. 13.

look to that: the Church is clear so far, because the necessity of the case and the general good so requires. It would be trifling here to urge, that it is forcing men to profane the holy Sacrament, or forcing them to repent and amend. That must be risked upon higher and more weighty considerations: for God's people must not be deprived of the benefit of the Sacrament in such cases. Therefore, I observed, that the considerations before mentioned have their weight; as indeed they ought to have; but so far only, as they are not opposed to other considerations of a more general nature, and of still greater weight.

The same Council made a strict order, that such of the resident clergy as came not to the daily prayers and Communion should be deposed, if they did not reform after admonition[m]. By this we see that daily Communions were yet kept up in some churches. Which appears likewise from the testimonies of Jerome[n] and Austin[o], of that time. Some Christians of that age were so scrupulous in that matter, that they thought themselves under a strict obligation to communicate, if possible, every day: others thought otherwise; and St. Austin was consulted upon the question. It was pleaded on the side of daily Communion, that every one ought to communicate as often as he worthily might; and that if he was not debarred by Church censures from it, he might be looked upon as worthy, the Church being judge of that case. On the other side it was pleaded, that some particular chosen days, when a man might be most recollected, and best prepared, were preferable; for so the greater reverence would be shewn towards the Sacrament, and it would be more likely to answer its end and use. St. Austin did not care to determine for either, but took a middle way to compro-

[m] 'Clericus, si intra civitatem fuerit, vel in loco quo ecclesia est, aut castello, aut vico, aut villa, et ad ecclesiam ad sacrificium quotidianum non accesserit, clericus non habeatur, si castigatus per satisfactionem veniam ab episcopo noluerit promereri.' Concil. Tolet. i. Can. 5.

[n] 'Scio Romae hanc esse consuetudinem ut fideles semper Christi corpus accipiant: quod nec reprehendo, nec laudo; unusquisque enim in suo sensu abundat.' Hieron. adv. Jovin. p. 239. Cp. Ep. lii. ad Lucin. p. 579, ed. Bened.

[o] 'Alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt.' Augustin. Epist. ad Jan. liv. (alias cxviii.) p. 124. tom. ii. edit. Bened.

mise the dispute; which was to advise both parties (as they intended the same thing in the main) to shew their reverence to the Sacrament in their different ways, according to their respective persuasions. For, says he, 'neither of them really dishonours the Lord's body and blood, while both contend, only in a different way, who shall do most honour to the blessed Sacrament. For neither did Zaccheus and the Centurion strive together, or one prefer himself before the other, when the former gladly received our Lord into his house, and the latter said, "I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof:" but both did honour to our Saviour in their several, or rather, contrary ways; both were sinners, and both found mercy.—So here, one out of reverence dares not partake every day: another out of the like reverence, dares not omit it a single day: all is well, so long as there is no contempt in either case upon the holy Sacrament[p].' This resolution of St. Austin was most certainly very wise and just, suitable to the question as there stated, whether a man should communicate every day, or only upon some select days, when fittest for it. But had the question been, whether it were sufficient for persons fitly prepared to communicate once or twice a year, or the like, he would have said no, but oftener; either every month, or every week, if opportunity offered. Gennadius, who lived in the close of the same century, (about A.D. 495,) determined as cautiously about daily receiving, neither approving or disapproving it: but weekly receiving he spoke fully up to, recommending it as highly proper for all that were competently prepared, that is, for all that were sincerely penitent, and were not under any prevailing inclination to vice[q].

[p] 'Neuter enim eorum exhonorat corpus et sanguinem Domini, sed saluberrimum sacramentum certatim honorare contendunt. Neque enim litigaverunt inter se, aut quisquam eorum se alteri praeposuit Zachaeus et ille Centurio, cum alter eorum gaudens in domum suam susceperit Dominum. Alter dixerit; Non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum: ambo Salvatorem honorificantes diverso, et quasi contrario, modo; ambo peccatis miseri, ambo misericordiam consecuti. . . . Ille honorando non audet quotidie sumere; et ille honorando non audet ullo die praetermittere. Contemptum solum non vult cibus iste,' &c. Augustin. ibid. p. 125.

[q] 'Quotidie Eucharistiae communionem percipere nec laudo nec vitupero: omnibus tamen Dominicis diebus communicandum suadeo et hortor; si tamen mens in affectu

Century the Sixth.

In the beginning of this century (about A. D. 506) the Council of Agde, in Gaul, obliged the laity to receive three times a year at least, at the three great festivals, Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide[r]. It is the first precedent of that kind: and some very pious and serious Christians have wished, that it never had been set, because it might furnish an handle to many for imagining that they were under no obligation to greater frequency. But the Council designed no such inference; which at best is but a perverse construction of the thing: only, they considered, that to oblige all persons to receive weekly was impracticable: and to exhort them to frequency at large, without specifying any certain times, was doing nothing; and that if ordinary Christians were left to themselves, they would not, probably, communicate so often as thrice in the year, nor twice.

Other Councils, later in the same century, revived the more ancient rules: the Councils of Braccara and Luca, in Spain, (A.D. 572,) approved of the collection of old canons drawn up by Martinus Braccarensis; among which is the Second Antiochian canon, above recited, being the eighty-third in this collection[s]. Afterwards, the second Council of Mâcon (A. D. 585) endeavoured to reinforce weekly communions, obliging both men and women to communicate every Lord's Day, under pain of

peccandi non sit. Nam habentem adhuc voluntatem peccandi, gravari magis dico Eucharistiae perceptione, quam purificari. Et ideo quamvis quis peccato mordeatur, peccandi non habeat de caetero voluntatem, et communicaturus satisfaciat lacrymis et orationibus, et confidens de Domini miseratione, qui peccata piae confessioni donare consuevit, accedat ad Eucharistiam intrepidus et securus. Sed hoc de illo dico, quem capitalia et mortalia peccata non gravant.' Gennad. Massil. inter August. Opp. tom. viii. App. p. 78. ed. Bened.

[r] 'Seculares, qui Natali Domini, Pascha, et Pentecosten, non communicaverint, Cathelici non credantur, nec inter Catholicos habeantur.' Concil. Agathens. Can. xviii. p. 1000. Hard.

[s] It is thus worded: 'Si quis intrat Ecclesiam Dei, et sacras Scripturas audit, et pro luxuria sua avertit se a communione sacramenti, et in observandis mysteriis declinat constitutam regulam disciplinae, istum talem projiciendum de Ecclesia Catholica decernimus,' &c. Concil. Braccarens. et Lucens. Can. lxxxiii. Hard. tom. iii. p. 400.

anathema[t]: which was severe enough, unless we may understand it only as opposed to absenting in way of scorn or contempt.

Century the Seventh.

I may here take notice, that the Council of Autun, in the year 670[u], revived the above-mentioned canon of the Council of Agde, about communicating three times a year, at the three great festivals. In this century, the Greeks used to communicate weekly; and such as neglected three weeks together were excommunicated: but in the Church of Rome, the people were left more to their own liberty[x].

Century the Eighth.

Venerable Bede, in his epistle to Ecgbriht Archbishop of York, in the year 734, has a passage to our purpose, worth the noting. He writes thus: 'The teachers... should instruct the people, how salutary daily communions might be to all kinds of Christians; a point which the Church of Christ through Italy, Gaul, Africa, Greece, and the whole East, have much laboured, as you well know. This solemn service of religion, and devout sanctification to Godward, is so far sunk almost among all the laity, by negligence of their teachers, that even those among them who appear to have a more than ordinary sense of religion, yet presume not to partake of those holy mysteries but upon the Nativity, Epiphany, and Easter: though there are innumerable persons of very innocent and chaste conversation, boys and girls, young men and maidens, old men and matrons, who, without the least scruple of doubt, might well receive every Lord's Day, or over and above, upon

[t] 'Decernimus, ut omnibus Dominicis diebus, altaris oblatio ab omnibus viris et mulieribus offeratur tam panis quam vini, ut per has immolationes, et peccatorum fascibus careant, et cum Abel, vel caeteris justis offerentibus, promereantur esse consortes. Omnes autem qui definitiones nostras per inobedientiam evacuare contendunt, anathemate percellantur.' Concil. Matiscon. II. Can. iv. Hard. tom. iii. p. 461.

[u] Concil. Augustodunens. Can. xiv. Hard. tom. iii. p. 1015.

[x] 'Graeci omni Dominica die communicant, sive Clerici sive Laici, et qui tribus Dominicis non communicaverint, excommunicantur. Romani similiter communicant qui volunt, qui autem noluerint, non excommunicantur.' Theodor. Poenitential. p. 46.

all the festivals, whether of Apostles or Martyrs; as you have seen with your own eyes, in the holy apostolical Church of Rome [y].'

From this remarkable paragraph, we may observe, that even so late as the eighth century, daily communions were still kept up, among some of the Clergy at least; and that all the Christian Churches, or Church guides of best note, wished to have the like prevail among the laity, and had laboured that point as far as they could: but as that was impracticable, hopes however were conceived, that weekly communions, and more, might yet take place, if due care were taken; and that it was in some measure owing to the remissness of pastors, that communion was grown so rare and uncommon among the laity of the better sort; who neglected the communion, when competently qualified for it, only for want of opportunity, or for want of being reminded of it and exhorted to it, or else out of ignorance, supineness, or the like, more than out of any dislike to it or unfitness for it: which may also be the case at this very day.

What has been here offered may be sufficient, I conceive, to give a competent idea of the state of frequent communion, for the first eight centuries: and I need not go lower; except it be to throw in a word or two of what has been done, as to this article, since the Reformation.

The Lutherans, we are told, by one that declares he is well assured of it [z], do in this particular excel all other Protestants:

[y] '. . . quam salutaris sit omni Christianorum generi quotidiana Dominici corporis ac sanguinis perceptio; juxta quod Ecclesiam Christi per Italiam, Galliam, Africam, Graeciam, ac totum Orientem solerter agere nosti. Quod videlicet genus religionis ac Deo devotae sanctificationis tam longe a cunctis pene nostrae provinciae laicis, per incuriam docentium, quasi prope peregrinum abest, ut hi qui inter religiosiores esse videntur, non nisi in Natali Domini, et Epiphania, et Pascha sacrosanctis mysteriis communicare praesumant; cum sint innumeri innocentes et castissimae conversationis pueri et puellae, juvenes et virgines, senes et anus, qui absque ullo scrupulo controversiae omni die Dominico, sive etiam in natalitiis sanctorum Apostolorum, sive Martyrum (quomodo ipse in sancta Romana et Apostolica Ecclesia fieri vidisti) mysteriis caelestibus communicare valeant.' Bed. Epist. ad Ecgbert. p. 311, edit. Cant.

[z] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 151. But compare Calvoer, a Lutheran, who gives but an indifferent account of the number of their communicants, being left to

for they have a communion every Sunday and holyday throughout the year. Calvin and Beza, and the French churches, laboured to restore monthly or weekly communions; but strictly insisted upon four times a year, under pain of contempt [a]. Our own Church has taken good care about frequent communion, time after time [b]. She has been one while charged as doing too little, and another while charged as doing too much: an argument that she has competently observed the golden mean. But in complicated cases, where there is no passing any certain judgment, without a large comprehensive view of a vast variety of circumstances, it is impossible to please everybody, or even to satisfy all the honest and well-deserving. In Queen Elizabeth's time, Mr. Cartwright managed the charge of remissness against us in that article: he would have had the generality obliged to communicate constantly, (except in cases of infirmity or necessity,) under pain of ecclesiastical censure, yea, and of civil penalties [c]. Dr. Whitgift, on the other hand, pleaded for moderate counsels and convenient discipline, considering the end and use, and how it might best be attained [d].

It is well known what canons have been since made to enforce frequent communion [e]: moderate enough, if compared with ancient canons, or even with those of other Reformed churches. For no express mention is made of excommunicating for neglect, but the affair is in a great measure left to the prudential care of the Diocesan, as is just and proper. Nevertheless, exceptions have been taken to the severity of those canons: and the charge has been well answered by our learned Divines [f], so that there is no occasion now to enter into that dispute. However, I am persuaded that instruction and exhortation, generally, are the best

their own liberty, and no particular times strictly insisted on. Calvoer. de Rit. Eccl. tom. i. p. 758.

[a] Bingham, French Church's Apology, c. xiv. L'Arroque, Conformity of the Reformed Churches of France, p. 246.

[b] See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 326.

[c] Cartwright, Reply to Whitgift, p. 117. Reply to Whitgift's Defence, part ii. p. 148.

[d] Whitgift, Defence of his Answer to the Admonition, p. 530, &c. Compare Hooker, book v. sect. 68.

[e] Canons of 1603. Can. 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 112.

[f] Falkner, Libert. Eccl. book i. c. 5. p. 205, &c. Sherlock, Defence of Stillingfleet, p. 119. Bingham, French Church's Apol. book iii. c. 14.

and most effectual methods of promoting frequent communion, so as to make it answer its true end and use. The most religious kind of persons will of course communicate as often as they have opportunity: the impenitent or irreligious will not choose to communicate at all; neither is it fit that they should, because, while they continue such, it would do them no good, but harm. There remain only the supine, careless, and ignorant, but well-disposed, (such as Bede, before cited, spake of,) who perhaps make up the main body of Christians: and they are to be dealt with in a tender, engaging manner, either by exhortations from the pulpit, or by private instruction, or by putting good books into their hands. Much probably might be done, in this way, towards reviving frequent communions, if suitable care and diligence were used in it. But I have said enough on this article, and it is now time to conclude. I once thought of adding a chapter upon the comportment proper at and after receiving the communion: but these papers are already drawn out into a length beyond what I at first suspected; and I may the more conveniently omit what relates to the demeanour proper at and after receiving, since it is well provided for by most of the little manuals which are in every one's hands, and particularly by Bishop Taylor's Worthy Communicant, chapter the seventh.

What I have endeavoured all the way, has been to maintain the dignity of a venerable sacrament, by the light of reason, Scripture, and antiquity, against unreasonable attempts to depreciate or undervalue it. The common methods of subversion begin with lessening the work of preparation, and then go on to sink the benefits: the next step in the progress is to reduce the whole to a bare memorial, a memorial of an absent friend, master, or chief martyr; passing over the Divine perfections of our Lord, and the all-sufficient merits of what he has done and suffered for us. Now in order to build up again, as others pull down, the business of these papers has been to shew, that the sacramental memorial is a memorial of Christ God-man, who died a willing sacrifice for the sins of mankind; and that it is not a bare memorial, or representation of something once done and suffered, but a real and present exhibition of the graces, comforts, or

blessings accruing therefrom, to every worthy receiver: that therefore proper acknowledgments and engagements are expected from us, and those require suitable preparations and qualifications, and a deportment thereto corresponding; in a word, self-examination and self-approbation beforehand, serious resolutions of amendment at the time, and a conscientious care afterwards, to persevere in well-doing to our lives' end.

THE DOCTRINAL USE

OF THE

CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS

CONSIDERED:

IN

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE MIDDLESEX CLERGY,

MAY 12th, 1736.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE

MIDDLESEX CLERGY.

Reverend Brethren,

As it hath been customary, upon these occasions, to recommend some important point of Christianity; so I take the liberty to offer to your thoughts, at this juncture, the consideration of the Christian Sacraments. Not that I can have room, in a short discourse, to enter into the heart of the subject: but the time perhaps may permit me to single out some collateral article, of moderate compass, and to throw in a few incidental reflections, tending to illustrate the value and dignity of those Divine ordinances, and to preserve in our minds a just regard and veneration for them.

When we duly consider the many excellent ends and purposes for which these holy Sacraments were ordained, or have been found in fact to serve, through a long succession of ages, we shall see great reason to adore the Divine wisdom and goodness in the appointment of them. They are of admirable use many ways; either for confirming our faith in the Christian religion at large, and the prime articles of it; or for promoting Christian practice in this world; or for procuring eternal happiness in a world to come.

I shall confine my present views to the first particular, the subserviency of the Sacraments to true and sound faith: which, though it may be looked upon as a bye-point, and for that reason hath not been so commonly insisted upon; may yet be of weight sufficient to deserve some consideration at this time.

I. Give me leave then to take notice, in the first place, that the Sacraments of the Church have all along been, and are to this day, standing monuments of the truth of Christianity against Atheists, Deists, Jews, Turks, Pagans, and all kinds of infidels. They bear date as early as the Gospel itself; and have continued, without interruption, from the days of their Founder. They proclaim to the world, that there once was such a person as Christ Jesus; that he lived, and died, and was buried, and rose again; and that he erected a Church, and drew the world after him, maugre all opposition; (which could never have been effected without many and great miracles;) and that he appointed these ordinances for the preserving and perpetuating the same Church, till his coming again. The two Sacraments, in this view, are abiding memorials of Christ and of his religion, and are of impregnable force against unbelievers, who presume either to call in question such plain facts, or to charge our most holy religion, as an invention of men.

II. But besides this general use of the Sacraments against unbelievers, they have been further of great service all along, for the supporting of particular doctrines of prime value, against misbelievers of various kinds; as may appear by an historical deduction all the way down from the earliest ages of the Church to the present times.

No sooner did some misbelieving Christians[a] of the apostolical age endeavour to deprave the true Gospel doctrine of God made man, rejecting our Lord's humanity, but the Sacrament of the Eucharist, carrying in it so indisputable a reference to our Lord's real flesh and blood, bore testimony against them with a force irresistible. They were so sensible of it, that within a while they forbore coming either to the holy Communion, or to the prayers that belonged to it[b], merely for the sake of avoiding a

[a] The Docetae, or Phantasiastae, whom in English we may call Visionaries; men that would not admit that our Lord assumed real flesh and blood, but in appearance only; considering him as a walking phantom or apparition, in order to take off the scandal of the cross, or for other as weak reasons. Some short account of them may be seen in my Importance, vol. iii. pp. 402, 547, or a larger and more distinct one in Buddaeus's Eccles. Apostol. pp. 550–570.

[b] Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχα-

practice contradictory to their principles. However, this was sufficient intimation to every honest Christian, of the meanest capacity, that their principles must be false, which obliged them in consequence to vilify and reject the plain and certain institutions of Christ. There was no need of entering into the subtilties of argument; for the thing declared itself, and left no room for dispute. Such was the valuable use of this Sacrament, at that time, for supporting truth and detecting error, for the confirming the faithful in the right way, and for confounding seducers.

III. In the century next following, the Valentinian Gnostics corrupted the faith of Christ more ways than one, but particularly in pretending that this lower or visible world was not made by God most high, but by some inferior power or aeon. Here again the Sacrament of the Eucharist was of signal service for the confuting such wild doctrine, and for the guarding sincere Christians against the smooth insinuations of artful disputers. It was very plain, that the bread and wine in that Sacrament were presented before God, as his creatures and his gifts; which amounted, in just construction, to a recognising him as their true Creator: and it was absurd to imagine that God should accept of, and sanctify to heavenly purposes, creatures not his own[c]. Besides, our Lord had chosen these creatures of the lower world to represent his own body and blood, and called them his body and blood, as being indeed such in Divine construction and beneficial effect to all worthy receivers: a plain argument that he looked upon them as his own and his Father's creatures, and not belonging to any strange creator, with whom neither he nor his Father had anything to do.

ριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c. Ignat. ad Smyrn. c. vii. p. 4. Le Clerc well comments upon this passage: 'Quod quidem convenienter ceterae suae doctrinae faciebant: cum enim Eucharistia sit instituta ad celebrandum memoriam corporis Christi pro nobis fracti, et sanguinis effusi, non poterat celebrari, ex instituto Christi, ab hominibus qui mortuum non esse Christum putabant, nisi sibi ipsi contradicerent.' Eccl. Hist. pp. 568, 569.

[c] Tertullian afterwards makes use of the same argument, against the same error, as espoused by the Marcionites: and he strengthens it further, by taking in the other Sacrament also. 'Sed ille quidem (Deus noster) usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, qua suos abluit . . . nec panem quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat.' Contra Marcion. lib. i. cap. 14.

These arguments, drawn from the holy Eucharist, were triumphantly urged against those false teachers, by an eminent Father of that time[d]: who, no doubt, made choice of them as the most affecting and sensible of any; being more entertaining than dry criticisms upon texts, or abstracted reasonings, and more likely to leave strong and lively impressions upon the minds of common Christians. At the same time they served to expose the adversaries to public shame, as appearing along with others at the holy Communion, while they taught things directly contrary to the known language of that Sacrament.

IV. The same deceivers, upon some specious pretences, (but such as no cause can want, that does not want artful pleaders,) took upon them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; conceiving that the unbodied soul only had any concern in a life to come[e]. Here again, the Sacrament of the Eucharist was a kind of armour of proof against the seducers. For as the consecrated bread and wine were the authentic symbols of Christ's body and blood, and were, in construction and certain effect, (though not in substance,) the same with what they stood for, to all worthy receivers; it was manifest, that bodies so incorporated with the body of Christ must of course be partners with it in a glorious resurrection. Thus was the Eucharist considered as a sure and certain pledge to all good men of the future resurrection of their bodies, symbolically fed with the body of Christ. For like as the branches partake of the vine, and the members of the head, so the bodies of the faithful, being by the Eucharist incorporate with Christ's glorified body, must of consequence appertain to it, and be glorified with it. This is the argument which the Christian Fathers[f] of those times insisted upon, and

[d] 'Nostra autem consonans est sententia Eucharistiae, et Eucharistia rursus confirmat sententiam nostram: offerimus enim ei quae sunt ejus.' Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251. edit. Bened. Cp. cap. xxxiii. p. 270. Cp. Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. i. cap. 14.

[e] Basilides, probably of the first century, taught this doctrine. Iren. lib. i. cap. 24. p. 102. Afterwards, Cerdo also, and Marcion, lib. i. cap. 27. p. 106. The Valentinian Gnostics also taught the same, lib. v. cap. 1. p. 292.

[f] Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. cap. xx. p. 19. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251. lib. v. cap. 2. p. 294. Tertull. de

with this they prevailed; as it was an argument easily understood [g] and sensibly felt, (by as many as had any tender regard for the Sacraments of the Church,) and as it expressed to the life the inconsistent conduct of the new teachers, proclaiming them to be self-condemned. Wherefore they were put in mind over and over, to correct either their practice or their principles; and either to come no more to the holy Communion, or to espouse no more such doctrines as were contrary to it [h].

V. In the same century, or beginning of the next, when the Marcionites revived the old pretences of the Visionaries, rejecting our Lord's humanity; the Eucharist still served, as before, to confound the adversaries: for it was impossible to invent any just reply to this plain argument, that our Lord's appointing a memorial to be observed, of his body broken and of his blood shed, must imply, that he really took part of flesh and blood, and was in substance and in truth what the Sacrament sets forth in symbols and figures [i].

Resurr. Carnis, cap. viii. p. 330. Rigalt. Cp. Athanas. Epist. iv. ad Serap. p. 710. ed. Bened.

[g] Notwithstanding the plainness of the argument, a very learned and ingenious Lutheran declares, that he does not understand it, can make no sense or consequence of it. (Pfaff. Notae in Iren. Fragm. 84, 85.) I suppose the reason is, because it agrees not with the Lutheran notion of the presence: for indeed, as such corporal or local presence supposes Christ's body and blood to be received by all communicants, both good and bad, Irenaeus's arguments will by no means favour that hypothesis, nor consist with it. His reasoning will extend only to good men, real members of Christ's body, men whose bodies, by the Eucharist worthily received, (perseverance supposed,) are made abiding members of Christ's body, flesh, and bones. The argument, so stated, proves the resurrection of such persons; and it is all that it directly proves: which however was sufficient against those who admitted no resurrection of the body, but denied all. . . N.B. The argument is of as little force on the hypothesis of transubstantiation; as is plain from what has been hinted of the other.

[h] Ἡ τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαξάτωσαν, ἢ τὸ προσφέρειν τὰ εἰρημένα παραιτείσθωσαν. ἡμῶν δὲ σύμφωνος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία . . , βεβαιοῖ τὴν γνώμην. Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251.

[i] 'Acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum, dicendo; id est figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus: ceterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset.' Tertull. adv. Marc. lib. iv. c. 40. p. 458. Cp. Pseud. Orig. Dial. contr. Marcion. lib. iv. p. 853. ed. Bened.

VI. When the Encratitae, or Continents, of the second century, (so called from their overscrupulous abstemiousness,) had contracted odd prejudices against the use of wine, as absolutely unlawful; the Sacrament of the Eucharist was justly pleaded, as alone sufficient to correct their groundless surmises [k]: but rather than part with a favourite principle, they chose to celebrate the Communion in water only, rejecting wine; and were from thence styled Aquarians [l]. Which practice of theirs served however to detect their hypocrisy, and to take off the sheep's clothing: for nobody could now make it any question, whether those so seemingly conscientious and self-denying teachers were really deceivers, when they were found to make no scruple of violating a holy Sacrament, and running directly counter to the express commands and known practice of Christ their Lord.

VII. When the Praxeans, Noetians, and Sabellians, of the second and third centuries, presumed to innovate in the doctrine of the Trinity, by reducing the three Persons of the Godhead to one; then the Sacrament of Baptism remarkably manifested its doctrinal force, to the confusion of those misbelievers. There was no resisting the pointed language of the sacramental form, which ran distinctly in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost [m]. It seems, that those men being conscious of it, did therefore change our Lord's form, and baptized in a new one of their own [n]; not considering, that that was plunging deeper than before, and adding iniquitous practice to ungodly principles. But the case was desperate, and they had no other way left to make themselves appear consistent men. In the meanwhile, their carrying matters to such lengths could not but make their false doctrine the more notorious to all men, and prevent its stealing upon honest and well disposed

[k] Vid. Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 186. Strom. lib. i. p. 359.

[l] Epiphan. Haeres. xlvii. 3. Theodorit. Haeret. Fab. lib. i. cap. 21. Philastrius, Haer. lxxvii. p. 146. Augustinus, Haer. cap. lxiv.

[m] Vid. Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 26, 27. Hippol. contra Noet. cap. xiv. p. 16.

[n] Vid. Bevereg. Vindic. Can. lib. ii. cap. 6. p. 252. Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. lib. xi. cap. 3. p. 7.

Christians, by ignorance or surprise. Such was the seasonable use of the Sacrament of Baptism in that instance; detecting error, and obstructing its progress, and strongly supporting the true faith.

VIII. When the Arians, of the fourth century, took upon them to deprave the doctrine of the Trinity in an opposite extreme, by rejecting the Deity of our Saviour Christ, 'who is over all, God blessed for ever[o];' then again the same Sacrament of Baptism reclaimed against novelty, and convicted the misbelievers in the face of the world. It was obvious to every impartial and considering man, that the form of Baptism ran equally in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that it could never be intended to initiate Christ's disciples in the belief and worship of God and two creatures[p]. The new teachers however, in prudence, thought proper to continue the old form of baptizing, till the Eunomians, their successors, being plainer men, or being weary of a practice contradictory to their principles, resolved at length to set aside the Scripture form, and to substitute others more agreeable to their sentiments[q]. This was intimation sufficient to every well-disposed Christian to be upon his guard against the new doctrines, which were found to drive men to such desperate extremities. For now no man of ordinary discernment, who had any remains of godliness left in him, could make it matter of dispute, whether he ought to follow Eunomius or Christ.

There was a further use made of both Sacraments, by way of argument, in the Arian controversy. For when the Arians pleaded, that the words 'I and my Father are one' meant no more than an unity of will or consent, inasmuch as all the faithful were said to be one with Christ and with each other, on account of such unity of consent; the argument was retorted upon them in

[o] Rom. ix. 5.

[p] A full account of this argument may be seen in Bishop Stillingfleet on the Trinity, ch. ix. or in my eighth sermon per tot. vol. ii. or in Athanasius, pp. 510, 633. ed. Bened.

[q] Epiphan. Haer. lxxvi. Greg. Nyssen. contr. Eunom. lib. x. p. 278. Theodorit. Haeret. Fab. lib. iv. cap. 3. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. lib. v. cap. 24. Theodorus, Lect. lib. xi. p. 576. ed. Cant.

this manner: that as Christ had made himself really one with us, by taking our flesh and blood upon him in the incarnation; so again he had reciprocally made us really one with himself by the two Sacraments. For in Baptism we put on Christ, and in the Eucharist we are made partakers of his flesh and blood: and therefore the union of Christ's disciples with the Head, and with each other, (though far short of the essential union between Father and Son,) was more than a bare unity of will or consent; being a real, and vital, and substantial union, though withal mystical and spiritual. Thus Hilary of Poictiers (an eminent Father of that time) retorted the argument of the adversaries; throwing off their refined subtilties, by one plain and affecting consideration, drawn from the known doctrine of the Christian Sacraments [r].

IX. About the year 360 rose up the sect of Macedonians, otherwise called Pneumatomachi, impugners of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. They were a kind of Semi-Arians, admitting the Divinity of the second Person, but rejecting the Divinity of the third, and in broader terms than the Arians before them had done. However, the Sacrament of Baptism stood full in their way, being a lasting monument of the true Divinity of the third Person as well as of the second: and by that chiefly were the generality of Christians confirmed in the ancient faith, and preserved from falling into the snares of seducers [s].

X. About the year 370, or a little sooner, the sect of Apollinarians began to spread new doctrines, and to make some noise in the world. Among sundry other wrong tenets, they had this conceit, that the manhood of our Saviour Christ was converted into or absorbed in his Godhead. For they imagined, that by thus resolving two distinct natures into one, they should the more easily account for the one Person of Christ; not considering that the whole economy of man's redemption was founded in the plain Scripture doctrine of a Saviour both God and man. In

[r] Hilarius de Trinit. lib. viii. p. 951, &c. Cp. Cyrill. Alexandr. de Trin. Dial. i. p. 407.

[s] See St. Basil on this argument, De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 10, 12, 27, 29.

opposition to those dangerous tenets, the learned and eloquent Chrysostom (A.D. 405, circ.) made use of an argument drawn from the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to this effect; that the representative body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist (sanctified by Divine grace, but not converted into Divine substance) plainly implied, that the natural body of Christ, though joined with the Godhead, was not converted into Godhead: for like as the consecrated bread, though called Christ's body on account of its sanctification, did not cease to be bread; so the human nature of Christ, though dignified with the Divine, did not cease to be the same human nature which it always was[t]. We may call this either an argument or an illustration; for indeed it is both under different views. Considered as a similitude, it is an illustration of a case: but at the same time is an argument to shew, that the Apollinarians were widely mistaken in imagining that a change of qualities, circumstances, or names, inferred a change of nature and substance. Bread was still bread, though for good reasons dignified with the name of the Lord's body: and the man Christ was still man, though for good reasons (that is, on account of a personal union) dignified with the title of God. Thus the Sacrament of the Eucharist, being a memorial of the incarnation, and a kind of emblem of it[u], was made use

[t] 'Sicut enim, antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, Divina autem sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit; et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii praedicatur: sic et hic Divina ἐνιδρυσάσης (id est, inundante) corpori natura, unum Filium, unam Personam, utraque haec fecerunt; agnoscendum tamen inconfusam et indivisibilem rationem, non in una solum natura, sed in duabus perfectis.' Chrysost. Epist. ad Caesar. Monach. pp. 7, 8. ed. Harduin.

As to what concerns this Epistle, and our debates with the Romanists upon it, the reader may consult, if he pleases, besides Harduin, Frid. Spanheim. Opp. tom. i. p. 844. Le Moyne, Varia Sacra, tom. i. p. 530. Wake's Defence ag. M. de Meaux, printed 1686. Fabricii Bibl. Graec. tom. i. p. 433. Le Quien, Dissert. Damascen. p. 48. et in Notis, p. 270. Zornii Opusc. Sacr. tom. i. p. 727.

[u] Vid. Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 290. Apol. i. p. 96. ed. Thirlby.

N.B. The Eucharist was anciently considered as a kind of emblem of the incarnation, but in a loose general way: for like as there is an heavenly part and an earthly part here, so it is also there; and like as Divine grace together with the elements make the Eucharist, so the Divine Logos with the manhood

of to explain it, and to confirm the faithful in the ancient belief of that important article. But I proceed.

XI. About the year 410, Pelagius opened the prejudices which he had for some time privately entertained against the Church's Doctrine of original sin: but the Sacrament of Baptism looked him full in the face, and proved one of the most considerable obstacles to his progress. The prevailing practice had all along been to baptize infants: and the Church had understood it to be baptizing them for remission of sin. The inference was clear and certain, and level to the capacity of every common Christian. Wherefore this single argument had weight sufficient to bear down all the abstracted subtilties and laboured refinements of Pelagius and his associates, and proved one of the strongest securities to the Christian faith so far, during that momentous controversy [x].

XII. About the year 430 appeared the Nestorian heresy: which, dividing the manhood of our Lord from the Godhead, made in effect two Persons, or two Christs. Here the Sacrament of the Eucharist was again called in, to compose the difference, and to settle the point in question. For since the virtue and efficacy of the representative body was principally founded in the supposed personal union of the real body with the Divine nature of our Lord, it would be frustrating or evacuating all the efficacy of the Eucharist, to divide the manhood, in such a sense, from the Godhead [y]. The argument was just and weighty, and could not fail of its due effect among as many as had any tender regard for so divine and comfortable a Sacrament.

make God incarnate. But then the analogy or resemblance ought not to be strained beyond the intention of it: for there is this observable difference in the two cases; that in one case there is barely a conjunction or concomitance of the two natures, and that to the worthy receivers only: in the other, there is an absolute, permanent, and personal union. So then the Eucharist is but a faint, imperfect emblem of the other.

[x] A full and distinct account of this whole matter may be seen either in Vossius, Hist. Pelagian. lib. ii. par. 1. Thess. v. Opp. tom. vi. p. 603, &c. or in Dr. Wall's Hist. of Infant Baptism, part i. ch. 19.

[y] Vid. Cyrill. Alex. Epist. ad Nestor. p. 1290. Anathem. xi. p. 1294. cum Cyrill. Explan. apud Harduin. Concil. Cp. Albertin. de Eucharist. p. 754.

XIII. Within twenty years after, came up the Eutychian heresy; which, in the contrary extreme, so blended the Godhead and manhood together, as to make but one nature of both, after the example of the Apollinarians, whom I before mentioned. The Sacrament of the Eucharist was of eminent service in this cause also: for if the bread and wine in that Sacrament are what they have been called, (and as constantly believed to be,) symbols and figures of Christ's body and blood, then it is certain that our Lord really put on flesh and blood, and that his human nature was and is distinct from his Divine. To say, that 'the Word was made flesh,' or that the flesh was converted into the Word, in such a sense as to leave no distinct humanity, was as much as to say, that the Sacraments now make us not 'members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones[z];' and that the Eucharist in particular is an insignificant show, or worse, either not representing the truth of things, or representing a falsehood. Such was the argument made use of in the Eutychian controversy[a]: a plainer or stronger there could not be; nor any wherein the generality of Christians could think themselves more deeply concerned.

XIV. Long after this, in the eighth century, endeavours were employed by many to bring in the worship, or at least the use, of images into churches. In this case also, the Sacrament of the Eucharist was seasonably pleaded, for the giving some check to the growing corruption. The good Fathers of Constantinople, in the year 754, meeting in council to the number of 338, argued against images to this effect: that as our Lord had appointed no visible image of himself, his incarnation, or passion, but the eucharistical one, and probably intended that for a most effectual bar, to preclude all appearances of idolatry; it would be high presumption in men, without warrant, without occasion, and against the very design of our Lord in that Sacrament, to introduce any other kind of images of their own devising[b].

[z] Ephes. v. 30.

[a] The reader may see the ancient testimonies collected and commented upon in Albertinus, pp. 802, 835, 836, 867, 868, 874, 886.

[b] Vid. Acta Concil. Nicaen. secundi, tom. iii. vers. finem.

The opposite party, some time after, (A.D. 787,) in the second Council of Nice, eluded this plain reasoning, by pretending, falsely, that the sacred symbols are not the image of Christ's body and blood, but the very body and blood [c]: and thus they laid the seeds of that error, which grew up at length by degrees into the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation. For the true notion of the Eucharist lying cross to their darling schemes, they choose rather to deprave the Sacrament itself, than to stand corrected by it. However, all this tends to confirm the main point, which I have been insisting upon, that the Sacraments, among other very valuable uses, have for many ages upwards been the standing barriers against corruptions: though there are no fences so strong, nor any ramparts so high, but daring and desultorious wits may either break through them or leap over them.

XV. I shall add but one example more; and it shall be of Faustus Socinus, of the sixteenth century: a person of pregnant wit and teeming invention; of moderate learning, but a very large share of sufficiency. His great ambition was, to strike out a new system of religion from his own conceits; though he happened only to revive (and perhaps very ignorantly) the ancient Sabellianism, Photinianism, and Pelagianism, with other exploded heresies. He began with subverting (as far as in him lay) the true and ancient doctrine of the Trinity, rejecting the Deity of the second Person, and even the being of the third. After a thousand subtilties brought to elude plain Scripture, and after infinite pains taken in so unnatural a war against Heaven, he was yet sensible, that he should prevail nothing, unless, together with the doctrine of the Trinity, he could discard the two Sacraments also, or render them contemptible. Baptism was a standing monument of the personality and equal Divinity of

[c] N.B. They might justly have said, that the sacred symbols are more than a mere image, more than mere signs and figures: but they should not have denied their being images at all. And they might justly have said, that the sacred symbols are, in construction and beneficial effect, to worthy receivers, the very body and blood: but they ought not to have asserted what they did, in that absolute manner, or in such crude terms, left without the proper qualifying explanations.

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and the other Sacrament was an abiding memorial of the merits (though no creature can merit) of our Lord's obedience and sufferings: and both together were lasting attestations, all the way down from the very infancy of the Church, of the secret workings, the heavenly graces and influences of the Holy Spirit upon the faithful receivers. Therefore to let the Sacraments stand, as aforetime, was leaving the ancient faith to grow up again in the Christian world, much faster than Socinus, with all his subtile explications of Scripture texts, could bear it down. Being well aware how this matter was, he fell next upon the Sacraments; discarding one of them, in a manner, under pretence that it was needless; and castrating the other, with respect to what was most valuable in it, to render it despicable. It was thought somewhat odd, by some of his own friends [d], that he should labour to throw off Baptism, and at the same time retain the Eucharist, which appeared to be comparatively of slighter moment, and less insisted upon in Scripture. But he well knew what he did; for the form of Baptism stood most directly in his way. As to the Eucharist, if he could but reduce it to a bare commemoration of an absent friend, there would be nothing left in it to create him much trouble; but it might look sincere and ingenuous, in that instance at least, to abide by the letter of the text, and to plead for the perpetuity of an ancient and venerable (now by him made a nominal) Sacrament. This appears to be the most natural account of his conduct in the whole affair. For otherwise it is a very plain case, that a lively imagination like his might have invented as fair or fairer pretexts for laying aside the Eucharist [e], than for discarding Baptism; and it might have been easier to elude some few places of Scripture than many. But I return.

From the induction of particulars here drawn together, and laid before you, may be understood, by the way, the true and

[d] Vid. Ruari Epistolae, vol. ii. p. 251.

[e] Indeed, the same pretences, some of them, equally affect both Sacraments, and tend to the discarding of both, or neither; as Vossius justly remarks, De Baptismo.

right notion of the Christian Eucharist, such as obtained from the beginning, and continued till the dark ages came on, and longer: but the point which I aimed at was, to illustrate the use of both the Sacraments considered as fences or barriers, ordained by Christ, to secure the true faith, and to preclude false doctrines. Few have ever attempted to corrupt Christianity in any of its considerable branches, but, first or last, they have found themselves embarrassed by one or both Sacraments; and have been thereby obliged either to desist presently, or to expose themselves further, by quarrelling with those sacred institutions, which all wise and good men have ever most highly revered.

I have taken notice, how the most essential articles of the Christian religion have, in their several turns, (as they happened to be attacked,) been supported and strengthened by these auxiliary means. The doctrine of the visible creation by God most high: the doctrine of our redemption by Christ, both God and man: the doctrine of sanctifying grace by the Holy Spirit of God, a real Person, and also Divine: the doctrines of original sin, and of our Lord's meritorious sacrifice, and of a future resurrection of the body: these, and as many others as are contained in these, have all been eminently preserved and held up by the Christian Sacraments. The Sacraments therefore are full of excellent instruction and admonition: they carry creeds and commandments, as it were, in the bowels of them: they speak even to the eyes in silent imagery, and often teach more in dumb show, with less expense of time and much greater efficacy, than any the most eloquent discourses could do. The Romanists have sometimes boasted, that images are the laymen's books, wherein the unlearned may read what it concerns them to know, without knowing letters. And indeed, if images had been authorized, or had they not been prohibited books, they might have been admitted with a better grace. But our Sacraments are the true books, (or serving as books,) both to learned and unlearned; full of lively imagery and instructive emblem; drawn by Christ himself, and left as his legacies, for the use of all the churches.

Let us then, my Reverend Brethren, be careful to preserve these sacred deposits with all due reverence and watchfulness; inasmuch as they contain treasures of infinite value; and Christianity itself appears to be so entirely wrapped up in them, that, humanly speaking, it must unavoidably stand or fall with them.

THE

CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE

EXPLAINED,

IN

A CHARGE

DELIVERED IN PART TO

THE MIDDLESEX CLERGY

AT

ST. CLEMENT-DANES,

APRIL THE 20th, 1738.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

AN APPENDIX.

Reverend Brethren,

The Sacrament of the Eucharist has for some time been the subject of debate amongst us, and appears to be so still, in some measure; particularly with regard to the sacrificial part of it. As it is a federal rite between God and man, so it must be supposed to carry in it something that God gives to us, and something also that we give, or present, to God. These are, as it were, the two integral parts of that holy ceremony: the former may properly be called the sacramental part, and the latter, the sacrificial. Any great mistake concerning either may be of very ill consequence to the main thing: for if we either mistake the nature of God's engagements towards us, or the nature of our engagements towards God, in that sacred solemnity, we so far defeat the great ends and uses of it, and prejudice ourselves in so doing.

A question was unhappily raised amongst us, about an hundred years ago, whether the material elements of the Eucharist were properly the Christian sacrifice. From thence arose some debate; which however lasted not long, nor spread very far. But at the beginning of this present century, the same question was again brought up, and the debate revived, with some warmth; and it is not altogether extinct even at this day.

Those who shall look narrowly into the heart of that dispute may see reason to judge, that a great part of it was owing to some confusion of ideas, or ambiguity of terms; more particularly, from the want of settling the definitions of sacrifice by certain rules, such as might satisfy reasonable men on both sides.

How that confusion at first arose may perhaps be learned by looking back as far as to Bellarmine, about 1590, or however as far as to the Council of Trent, about thirty years higher. Before that time things were much clearer, so far as concerned this article. Nobody almost doubted but that the old definitions

of sacrifice were right, and that spiritual sacrifice was true and proper sacrifice, yea the most proper of any.

'Spiritual sacrifice' is St. Peter's phrase[a]: and it agrees with St. Paul's phrase of 'reasonable service[b]:' and both of them fall in with our Lord's own phrase, of 'worshipping God in spirit and in truth[c].' It is serving God 'in newness of spirit, not in the oldness of the letter[d].' It is offering him true sacrifice and direct homage, as opposed to legal and typical, in order to come at true and direct expiation, without the previous covers or shadows of legal and typical expiations, which reached only to the purifying of the flesh, not to the purging of the conscience[e]. This kind of sacrifice called spiritual does not mean mental service only, but takes in mental, vocal, and manual, the service of the heart, mouth, and hand; all true and direct service, bodily[f] service as well as any other, since we ought to serve God with our bodies as well as our souls. Such is the nature and quality of what Scripture and the ancients call spiritual sacrifice, as opposed to the outward letter. Such services have obtained the name of sacrifice ever since David's time[g], warranted by God himself, under the Old Testament and New. The Jews, before Christ and since[h], have frequently used the name of sacrifice in the same spiritual sense. The very Pagans were proud to borrow the same way of speaking[i] from Jews and Christians: so that custom of language has not run altogether on the side of material sacrifice. It may rather be said, that the custom of Christian language, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Church writers, has run on the side of spiritual sacrifice, without giving the

[a] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [b] Rom. xii. 1.

[c] John iv. 23. See Dodwell on Instrumental Music, p. 31. Stillingfleet, Serm. xxxix. p. 602. Scot, vol. iv. Serm. iv. [d] Rom. vii. 6.

[e] Heb. ix. 9, 13, 14.

[f] Rom. xii. 1. 1 Cor. vi. 20.

[g] They are emphatically styled sacrifices of God (Psalm li. 17), as being the fittest presents or gifts to him, the most acceptable offerings.

[h] Vid. Vitringa de vet. Synag. in Proleg. pp. 40, 41. Philo passim. Justin. Mart. Dial. p. 387.

[i] Porphyrius de Abstin. lib. ii. sect. 34. Cp. Euseb. Praep. Evangel. lib. iv. cap. 9–14. xiii. cap. 13. Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 686. ed. Ox. Even Plato, long before Christianity, had defined sacrifice to mean a present to the Divine Majesty; not confining it, so far as appears, to material, but leaving it at large, so as to comprehend either material or spiritual. See my Review, &c. above, p. 311.

least hint that it was not true sacrifice, or not sacrifice properly so called.

St. Austin's definition of true and Christian sacrifice [k] is well known, and need not here be repeated. He spoke the sense of the churches before him: and the Schools, after him, followed him in the same. Aquinas, at the head of the Schoolmen, may here speak for the rest: he determines, that a sacrifice, properly, is anything performed for God's sole and due honour, in order to appease him [l]. He plainly makes it a work, or service, not a material thing: and by that very rule he determined, that the sacrifice of the cross was a true sacrifice; which expression implies both proper and acceptable. This notion of sacrifice prevailed in that century, and in the centuries following, and was admitted by the early Reformers [m]; and even by Romanists also, as low as the year 1556, or yet lower. Alphonsus a Castro, of that time, a zealous Romanist, in a famous book (which between 1534 and 1556 had gone through ten or more editions) declared his full agreement with Calvin, so far as concerned the definition of true sacrifice, conformable to St. Austin's [n]. Even Bellarmine acknowledged, above thirty years after, that some noted Doctor of the Roman Church still adhered to the same definition [o]. So that spiritual sacrifice was not yet entirely excluded as improper, metaphorical, and nominal, among the Romanists themselves;

[k] 'Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaereamus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni quo veraciter beati esse possimus.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242. tom. 7. ed. Bened. Compare my Review, above, p. 309.

[l] 'Dicendum, quod sacrificium proprie dicitur aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum ad eum placandum. Et inde est quod Augustinus dicit, verum sacrificium est, &c. Christus autem, ut ibidem subditur, seipsum obtulit in passione pro nobis. Et hoc ipsum opus, quod voluntarie passionem sustinuit, Deo maxime acceptum fuit, utpote ex caritate maxime proveniens: unde manifestum est, quod passio Christi fuerit verum sacrificium.' Aquin. Summ. par. iii. q. 48.

[m] Vid. Melancthon. de Missa, p. 195. In Malachi, p. 545. tom. ii. Chemnit. Examen. part. ii. p. 137.

[n] After reciting Austin's definition, he proceeds: 'Haec Augustinus, ex quibus verbis aperte colligitur omne opus bonum quod Deo offertur, esse verum sacrificium, et hanc definitionem ipsemet Calvinus admittit... ex cujus verbis constat, inter nos et illum de veri sacrificii definitione convenire.' Alphons. a Castro, adv. Haeres. lib. x. p. 75. ed. 1565.

[o] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 710.

neither was it hitherto a ruled point amongst them, that material thing was essential to the nature, notion, or definition of true and proper sacrifice. How that came about afterwards, we shall see presently.

The Romanists, wanting arguments to support their mass sacrifice, thought of this pretence, among others, that either their mass must be the sacrifice of the Church, or the Church had really none: and so if the Protestants resolved to throw off the mass, they would be left without a sacrifice, without an altar, without a priesthood, and be no longer a Church [p]. The Protestants had two very just answers to make, which were much the same with what the primitive Christians had before made to the Pagans, when the like had been objected to them. The first was, that Christ himself was the Church's sacrifice [q], considered in a passive sense, as commemorated, applied, and participated in the Eucharist. The second was, that they had sacrifices besides, in the active sense, sacrifices of their own to offer, visibly, publicly, and by sacerdotal hands, in the Eucharist: which sacrifices were their prayers, and praises, and commemorations [r]; eucharistic sacrifices, properly, though propitiatory also in a qualified sense. The Council of Trent, in 1562, endeavoured to obviate both those answers [s]: and Bellarmine afterwards undertook formally to confute them. The Romanists had no way left but to affirm stoutly, and to endeavour weakly to prove, that

[p] Alphons. a Castro, lib. x. p. 74. Cp. Bellarmin de Missa, lib. i. cap. 20.

[q] Vid. Clem. Alex. pp. 688, 836. ed. Ox. Euseb. Demonstr. Evan. p. 38. Augustin. tom. iv. p. 1462. ed. Bened. Greg. M. tom. ii. p. 472. ed. Bened. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. ix.

[r] Justin Martyr, pp. 14, 19, 387, 389. ed. Thirlb. Clem. Alex. 686, 836, 848, 849, 850, 860. ed. Ox. Origen. tom. ii. pp. 210, 311, 191, 205, 243, 363, 418, 563. ed. Bened. Euseb. Dem. Evang. pp. 20, 21, 23. Tertullian, pp. 69, 188, 330. Rigalt. Cyprian. Ep. lxxvii. p. 159. ed. Bened. Hilarius Pictav. pp. 154, 228, 535. Basil. tom. iii. p. 52. ed. Bened. Chrysost. tom. v. pp. 231, 316, 503. ed. Bened. Hieronym. tom. ii. pp. 186, 250, 254. tom. iii. pp. 15, 1122, 1420. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. ii. p. 439. iv. pp. 14, 473, 455, 527, 498, 1026, 1113. vii. p. 240. ed. Bened. and compare my Review, chap. xii.

[s] 'Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, anathema sit. . . . Si quis dixerit missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium, anathema sit.' Concil. Trid. sess. xxii. can. 1, 3.

the two things which the Protestants insisted upon did neither singly, nor both together, amount to true and proper sacrifice. Here began all the subtilties and thorny perplexities which have darkened the subject ever since; and which must, I conceive, be thrown off, (together with the new and false definitions, which came in with them,) if ever we hope to clear the subject effectually, and to set it upon its true and ancient basis.

I shall pass over Bellarmine's trifling exceptions to the Protestant sacrifice, (meaning the grand sacrifice,) considered in the passive sense. It is self-evident, that while we have Christ, we want neither sacrifice, altar, nor priest; for in him we have all: and if he is the head, and we the body, there is the Church. Had we no active sacrifice at all, yet so long as we are empowered, by Divine commission, to convey the blessings[t] of the great sacrifice to as many as are worthy, we therein exercise an honourable priesthood[u], and may be said to magnify our office. But waving that consideration at present, for the sake of brevity, I shall proceed to examine what Bellarmine has objected to our sacrifices considered in the active sense, and to inquire by what kind of logic he attempted to discard all spiritual sacrifices, under the notion of improper, metaphorical, nominal sacrifices, or, in short, no sacrifices.

1. He pleads, that Scripture opposes good works to sacrifice; as particularly in Hosea vi. 6, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice:' therefore good works are not sacrifice properly so called[x]. But St. Austin long before had sufficiently obviated that pretence, by observing, that Scripture, in such instances, had only opposed one kind of sacrifice to another kind, symbolical to real, typical to true, shadow to substance[y]. God rejected

[t] Blessing was a considerable part of the sacerdotal office in the Aaronical priesthood. Numb. vi. 23–27. Deut. x. 8. xxi. 5.

[u] Some of the elder Romanists acknowledged this to be sufficient. 'Satis est, ut vere et proprie sit sacrificium, quod mors Christi ita nunc ad peccati remissionem applicetur, ac si nunc ipse Christus moreretur.' Canus, Loc. Theol. lib. xii. cap. 12.

[x] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 710.

[y] 'Per hoc ubi scriptum est, Misericordiam volo quam sacrificium, nihil aliud quam sacrificio sacrificium praelatum oportet intelligi: quoniam illud quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium signum est veri sacrificii.

the sign, which had almost engrossed the name, and pointed out the thing signified; which more justly deserved to be called sacrifice. So it was not opposing sacrifice to no sacrifice, but legal sacrifice to evangelical. Such was St. Austin's solution of the objected difficulty: and it appears to be very just and solid, sufficiently confirmed both by the Old Testament and New.

2. Bellarmine's next pretence is, that in every sacrifice, properly so called, there must be some sensible thing offered; because St. Paul has intimated, that a priest must have somewhat to offer. Heb. viii. 3 [z]. But St. Paul says 'somewhat,' not 'some sensible thing.' And certainly, if a man offers prayers, lauds, good works, &c. he offers somewhat, yea and somewhat sensible too: for public prayers, especially, are open to the sense of hearing, and public performances to more senses than one. Therefore the service may be the sacrifice, not the material things: and such service being evangelical, (not legal or typical,) is spiritual sacrifice.

3. The Cardinal has a third argument about elicit acts; which being highly metaphysical and fanciful, I choose rather to pass it off without further answer, than to offend your ears with it.

4. A fourth pretence is, that the sacrifice of the Church being but one, the spiritual sacrifices, which are many, cannot be that one sacrifice. Here he quotes Austin, Pope Leo, and Chrysostom, to prove that the Church's sacrifice is but one, and that one the Eucharist [a]. He might have spared the labour, because the same Fathers assert the sacrifice of the Eucharist to be both one and many, diversly considered: one complicated sacrifice, taking in the whole action; many sacrifices, if distinctly viewed under the several particulars. And though the Eucharist might

Porro autem misericordia est verum sacrificium.' Augustin. de Civ. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5.

N.B. In explication of what Austin says, 'quod ab omnibus,' &c. it may be noted, that he did not take the vulgar language for the best, or the only rule of propriety: he observes elsewhere (de Verb. Dom. Serm. liii.) that almost all call the Sacrament, (that is, sign of the body,) the body. 'Paene quidem sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt.' And yet he did not think that the sign was more properly the body, than the body itself, but quite otherwise.

[z] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 711.

[a] Ibid. p. 712.

by common use come to be called emphatically, the Sacrifice, as being most observable, or most excellent, or as comprehending more sacrifices in one than any other service did, yet it does not from thence follow that the other less observable or less considerable sacrifices were not properly sacrifices. For has not the same Eucharist, in vulgar speech, and by custom, come to be emphatically called, the Sacrament, as if there were no other Sacrament? And yet certain it is, that Baptism is as properly a Sacrament as the other. Emphatical appellations therefore are rather marks of the excellency or notoriety of a thing, than of strict propriety of speech. But I return to Bellarmine.

5. A fifth pretence is, that spiritual sacrifices, being common both to clergy and laity, require no proper priesthood, and therefore cannot be justly esteemed proper sacrifices; for proper sacrifice and proper priesthood, being relatives, must stand or fall together [b]. To which it may be answered, that even lay Christians, considered as offering spiritual sacrifices, are so far priests, according to the doctrine of the New Testament, confirmed by Catholic antiquity [c]. But waving that nicety, (as some may call it,) yet certainly when spiritual sacrifices are offered up by priests, divinely commissioned, and in the face of a Christian congregation, they are then as proper sacrifices as any other are, or can be: and this is sufficient to our purpose. Let the Eucharist therefore, duly administered by sacerdotal officers, be admitted as a sacrifice properly so called, but of the spiritual kind, and we desire nothing further. If a sacerdotal oblation of the people's loaf and wine can be thought sufficient to convert them into proper sacrifices, though they had nothing at all of a sacrificial nature in them before such oblation; surely the like sacerdotal oblation may much more convert the people's prayers, praises, and devout services (which previously had something of a sacrificial nature in them) into real and proper sacrifices, yea the properest of any [d]. Why then must our spiri-

[b] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 712.

[c] See my Review, above, p. 350.

[d] This matter is briefly and accurately expressed by our very learned and judicious Bp. Montague.

'In lege Christi sunt sacerdotes, non tantum illa laxa significatione, qua quotquot Jesu Christi sumus ἐπώνυμοι, (Christiani nominati,)

tual offerings be set aside as of no account in respect of proper sacrifice, only to take in other things of much lower account than they? Why should we take in those meaner things at all, as sacrifices, into our pure offerings, which are much better without them, and can only be defiled by such an heterogeneous mixture of legal and evangelical? Let the elements be signs (as they really are) of the sacrifice which we offer, as they are also signs of the sacrifice whereof we participate: that appears to be the end and use of them, (and great use it is,) and seems to be all the honour which God ever intended them. To be plainer, we ourselves are the sacrifice offered by those [e] symbols; and the victim of the cross is the sacrifice participated by the same symbols. But I proceed.

6. It is further argued against spiritual sacrifices, that they require no proper altar, as all proper sacrifices do: therefore they are not proper sacrifices [f]. This argument is faulty, more ways than one. For, 1. It can never be proved, that sacrifices, and altars are such inseparable relatives, that one may not subsist without the other. An altar seems to be rather a circumstance of convenience, or decency, than essential to sacrifice. It was accidental to the Jewish sacrifices, that they needed altars: and the reason was not because all sacrifices must have altars, but because sacrifices of such a kind could not be performed without them; otherwise, an altar appears no more necessary to a sacrifice, considered at large, than a case or a plate, a pix or a patin, is to a gift, or present. 2. Besides, how will it be made appear that the table on which our Lord consecrated the Eucharist, or the cross on which he suffered, was properly and

sumus etiam et dicimur sacerdotes, sed et illa magis stricta, qua qui populo acquisitionis praesunt ἐν νόμῳ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰς Θεὸν, Dei sunt et populi μεσῖται.... Habemus autem et altare, ad quod offerimus oblationes et sacrificia commemorationis, laudationis, orationis, nos, nostra, Deo, per sacerdotem.' Montacut. Orig. tom. ii. p. 313.

[e] The sacrifice of the cross, or Christ himself, may also be said to be offered in the Eucharist. But then it means only offered to view, or offered to Divine consideration: that is, represented before God, angels, and men, and pleaded before God as what we claim to; not offered again in sacrifice. See Field on the Church, pp. 204, 205. and my Review, above, p. 344.

[f] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. pp. 712, 713.

previously an altar? The Cardinal's argument proves too much to prove anything: for it does not only strike at the spiritual sacrifices, but at the mass sacrifice too, and even at the sacrifice of the cross, which had no proper altar[g]. But if it be said, that both the table and the cross were proper altars, as being the seats of proper sacrifices, then whatever is the seat of a spiritual sacrifice (which we now suppose to be proper) will, by parity of reason, be a spiritual altar also, and proper in its kind: so then, take the thing either way, the argument is frivolous, and concludes nothing[h]. I have now run through the Cardinal's subtilties on this head; excepting that some notice remains to be taken of his artful contrivance to elude St. Austin's definition of sacrifice, and therewith all the old definitions which had obtained in the Church for fifteen hundred years before.

7. He pretends, that that Father defined only true sacrifice, not proper sacrifice; and that therefore his definition comes not up to the point in hand: good works may be true sacrifices, in St. Austin's sense, but they will be improper, metaphorical, or nominal only, notwithstanding[i]. This is the substance of the pretext, laid down in its full force, and it will require a clear and distinct answer. First, I may take notice, that it is very odd, in this case especially, to make a distinction between true and proper, and to oppose one to the other. St. Austin, most undoubtedly, intended, under the word 'true,' to take in all Christian,

[g] Some make the cross itself the altar, which has been the current way of speaking from Origen of the third century. Others say, the Divine nature of our Lord was the altar, grounding it upon Heb. ix. 14. Others take in both, in different respects: but neither of them seems to have been an altar in strict propriety of speech, but rather in the way of analogy, or resemblance. This article has been minutely discussed by Cloppenburg. Opp. vol. i. p. 82, &c. Witsius, Miscellan. tom. i. p. 509. In Symb. Apostol. p. 146. Vitringa, Obs. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. 13. lib. iv. cap. 15. Deylingius, Obs. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 393. Miscellan. 559, 567.

[h] The Lord's table is by the ancients frequently called an altar, as being the seat of the elements, and so an altar in the same metonymical meaning, as the elements were body and blood, or the grand sacrifice itself. The Lord's table might also more properly be called an altar, as being that from which, or at which, prayers and praises and commemorations (spiritual sacrifices) were offered. See my Review, above, pp. 333, 334.

[i] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. p. 713. Cp. Vasquez, tom. iii. p. 507. Suarez, tom. iii. p. 886. Bapt. Scortia, p. 18.

all evangelical, all salutary or acceptable, yea all allowable sacrifices: and what can it signify to talk of any proper sacrifice (Jewish, suppose, or Pagan) as opposed to true, so long as such proper sacrifice is no sacrifice at all in Christian account, but a sacrilege rather, or a profanation? But I answer further, that there is no reason to imagine that St. Austin did not intend to include 'proper' under the word 'true.' It would not have been sufficient to his purpose to have said proper sacrifice, because Jewish and Pagan sacrifices might come under the same appellation: but he chose the word 'true,' as carrying in it more than 'proper,' and as expressing proper and salutary, or authorized, both in one. As true religion implies both proper and authorized religion, and as true worship implies the like; so true sacrifice implies both propriety as to the name, and truth as to the thing [k].

The point may be further argued from hence, that the ancient Fathers did not only call spiritual sacrifices real and true [l], but they looked upon them as the best, the noblest, the most perfect sacrifices, the most suitable and proper gifts or presents that could be offered to the Divine Majesty [m]: and they never dropped any hints of their being either improper or metaphorical. The Romanists knew this very well; and it may be useful to observe their exquisite subtilty in this argument. For after they have exploded, with a kind of popular clamour, all that the Fathers ever called true sacrifice, under the opprobrious name of improper

[k] In this sense St. Austin called our Lord's Sacrifice true. Contr. Faust. lib. xx. cap. 18. xxii. 17. Contr. advers. Leg. &c. lib. i. cap. 18.

[l] Justin. Dial. p. 389. ed. Thirlb. Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 248. ed. Bened. Origen. tom. ii. p. 362. ed. Bened. Clem. Alex. p. 686. ed. Ox. Lactant. Epit. 169, 204, 205. ed. Dav. Philastrius, Haer. cap. cix. p. 221. ed. Fabr. Hieronym. in Amos, cap. v. p. 1420. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. x. pp. 94, 242, 243, 256. ed. Bened. Gregor. Magn. Dial. lib. iv. cap. 59. p. 472. ed. Bened.

[m] Justin. Dial. p. 387. Athenagoras, pp. 48, 49. ed. Ox. Clem. Alex. pp. 836, 848, 849, 860. Tertullian, Apol. cap. xxx. De Orat. cap. 27, 28. Minuc. Felix, sect. xxxii. p. 183. Cyprian, Ep. lxxvii. p. 159. ed. Bened. Lactantius, Epit. cap. lviii. de vero Cultu, lib. vi. cap. 24, 25. Eusebius, Demonstr. p. 40. Hilarius Pictav. p. 154. ed. Bened. Basil, tom. iii. p. 207. ed. Bened. Nazianzen. tom. i. pp. 38, 484. Chrysostom. tom. v. pp. 20, 231, 316, 503. vii. 216. ed. Bened. Augustin. tom. v. p. 268. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 20. lib. xix. cap. 23. Isidorus Pelus. lib. iii. Ep. 75.

and metaphorical [n], and have raised an odium against Protestants for admitting no other, then, (as if they had forgot all that they had been before doing,) they fetch a round, and come upon us with the high and emphatical expressions of the Fathers, asking, how we can be so dull as to understand them of metaphorical, nominal sacrifices [o]? Yet we are very certain, that all those high expressions of the Fathers belonged only to spiritual sacrifices; the very same that Bellarmine and the rest discard as improper and metaphorical.

But they here play fast and loose with us: first, pretending that the true and noble sacrifices of the ancients did not mean proper ones, in order to discard the old definitions; and then again, (to serve another turn,) pretending that those very sacrifices must have been proper, (not metaphorical,) because the Fathers so highly esteemed them, and spake so honourably of them. In short, the whole artifice terminates in this, that the self-same sacrifices as admitted by Protestants shall be called metaphorical, in order to disgrace the Protestant cause, but shall be called proper and true as admitted by the Fathers, in order to keep up some show of agreement in this article with antiquity. But I return to the Cardinal, whom I left disabling all the old definitions, in order to introduce a new one of his own, a very strange one [p]; fitted indeed to throw out spiritual sacrifice most effectually, (which was what he chiefly aimed at,) but at the same time also overthrowing, undesignedly, both the sacrifice of the mass and the sacrifice of the cross.

1. As to the sacrifice of the mass, the subject of it is supposed to be our Lord's natural body, invisible in the Eucharist; and yet, by the definition, the sacrifice should be 'res sensibilis [q],' some-

[n] Vide Suarez, tom. iii. pp. 886, 891, 892, 893, 896.

[o] Vide Petavius, Eccl. Dogm. tom. iii. p. 130.

[p] A definition of one kind of sacrifice, (Jewish, as it seems,) rather than of sacrifice in general, or of Christian in particular. It is giving us a species for the genus, like the making a definition of man, and then calling it a definition of animal.

[q] 'Sacrificium est oblatio externa, facta soli Deo, qua ad agnitionem humanae infirmitatis, et professionem Divinae majestatis, a legitimo ministro res aliqua sensibilis et permanens, in ritu mystico, consecratur, et transmutatur, ita ut plane destruatur.' Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 2. pp. 715, 717.

thing visible, obvious to one or more of the senses. Again, our Lord's body is not liable any more to destruction; and yet, by the definition, the sacrifice should be destroyed. But I shall insist no longer upon the Cardinal's inconsistencies in that article, because he has often been called to account for them by learned Protestants[r].

2. The second article, relating to the sacrifice of the cross, has been less taken notice of: but it is certain, that Bellarmine's definition is no more friendly to that than to the other.

If our Lord's soul was any part of his offering, (as Scripture seems to intimate[s], and as the Fathers plainly teach[t], and the reason of the thing persuades,) or if his life was an offering, which Scripture plainly, and more than once testifies[u]; then 'res aliqua sensibilis,' 'some sensible thing' is not the true notion of proper sacrifice, neither is it essential to the definition of it; unless the life which our Lord gave upon the cross was no proper sacrifice. Perhaps, in strictness of notion, his 'obedience unto death[v],' his amazing act of philanthropy, (so highly extolled in the New Testament,) was properly the acceptable sacrifice. So Aquinas states that matter, as I before noted: and Bellarmine was aware of it, in another chapter, wherein he undertakes to prove, that our Lord's death was a proper sacrifice[w]. There he was obliged to say, though he says it coldly, that acts of charity are 'quoddam sacrificium,' a kind of sacrifice. But the question was about proper sacrifice, and about our Lord's philanthropy: was that only 'quoddam sacrificium,' or was it not proper? Here the Cardinal was nonplussed, and had no way to extricate himself, but by admitting (faintly however and tacitly, as conscious of self-contradiction) that spiritual sacrifice may be proper sacrifice,

[r] Joann. Forbesius, p. 615. Montacutius, Orig. tom. ii. pp. 302, 357. Bishop Morton, b. vi. cap. 6. pp. 467, 468, &c. Hakewill, p. 8. Brevint. Depth and Mystery, &c. pp. 133, 144. Payne on the Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 70. Bishop Kidder, pp. 316, 415.

[s] Isa. liii. 10, 11, 12. Psalm xvi. 10. Luke xxiii. 46.

[t] Clem. Roman. cap. xlix. Irenaeus, p. 292. ed. Bened. Hieronym. tom. ii. part. 2. pp. 167, 173. ed. Bened. Fulgentius ad Thrasimund. lib. iii. Compare Bishop Bilson, Full Redemption, &c. p. 83, &c.

[u] Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. John x. 11, 15, 17. xv. 13. 1 John iii. 16.

[v] Phil. ii. 8. Heb. v. 8.

[w] Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. i. cap. 3 p. 718.

and is not always metaphorical: otherwise, the very brightest part of our Lord's own sacrifice, the very flower and perfection of it, his most stupendous work of philanthropy, must have been thrown off, under the low and disparaging names of metaphorical, improper, nominal sacrifice.

Having seen how the ablest champion of the Romish cause failed in his attempts against spiritual sacrifices, failed in not proving his point, failed also in over proving, we may now with the greater assurance maintain, that the old definitions, which took in spiritual sacrifice, were true and just, and that the new ones, arbitrarily introduced, in the decline of the sixteenth century, are false and wrong; such as one would expect from men zealous for a party cause, and disposed to support manifest errors and absurdities, at any rate whatsoever.

After pointing out the rise of the new definitions, I am next to observe what their progress was, and what the result or issue of them. It must, I am afraid, be owned, that our Romish adversaries were but too successful in spreading mists and darkness all over the subject, in opening a new and wide field of dispute, thereby drawing the Protestants, more or less, out of their safe intrenchments; dividing them also, if not as to their main sentiments, yet at least as to their modes of expression and their methods of defence.

How this affair had been fixed amongst us, but a few years before, may be collected from Archbishop Sandys's judicious definition of sacrifice [x], published in 1585, and contrived to take in sacrifices both of the material and spiritual kind. Dr. Bilson also (afterwards Bishop) published his book of Christian Subjection, the same year; wherein he took occasion to assert, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, yea, and a true sacrifice; but understanding it to be of the spiritual kind [y]. This kind of language

[x] 'Sacrificing is a voluntary action whereby we worship God, offering him somewhat, in token that we acknowledge him to be the Lord, and ourselves his servants.' Sandys, Serm. xxi. p. 185.

[y] 'Malachi speaketh of the true sacrifice, which, from the beginning, and so to the end, was and shall be more acceptable to God, than the bloody and external sacrifices of the Jews.' Bilson, p. 696.

'Neither they nor I ever denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice. The very name enforceth it to be the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;

(the uniform language of antiquity, and of the whole reformation [z] for sixty or seventy years,) began to vary in some measure, from Bellarmine's time, and more and more so, both here and abroad. Some indeed stood by the old definitions and ancient language concerning the Eucharist: more went off from it; and so Protestants became divided, in sounds at least, while they differed not much in sense. Many finding that they were sufficiently able to maintain their ground against the Romanists, even upon the foot of the Romish definitions, never troubled themselves further to examine how just they were: it was enough, they thought, that the Romanists could not prove the Eucharist a true and proper Sacrifice, in their own way of defining; and the rest seemed to be only contending about words and names. Nevertheless the more thoughtful and considerate men saw what advantage the adversaries might make by aspersing the Protestants as having no sacrifice properly so called, nor pretending to any: besides that the dignity of a venerable Sacrament would probably suffer much by it; and the ancient Fathers, who were very wise men, had never consented (though as much provoked to it by the Pagan objectors) to lessen the dignity of their true and real sacrifices by the low and diminutive names of improper or metaphorical. They always stood to it, that they had sacrifices, yea and true sacrifices, (of the spiritual [a] kind,) the noblest and divinest that could be offered; while all

which is the true and lively sacrifice of the New Testament. The Lord's table, in respect of his graces and mercies there proposed to us, is an heavenly banquet, which we must eat, and not sacrifice: but the duties which he requireth at our hands, when we approach his table, are sacrifices, not sacraments. As namely, to offer him thanks and praises, faith and obedience, yea our bodies and souls, to be living, holy, and acceptable sacrifices unto him, which is our reasonable service.' Bilson, p. 699.

[z] Beza's account (in 1577) may serve for a specimen:

'Coena Domini sacrificii rationem habet, idque triplici respectu. 1. Quatenus in ea aliquid Deo offerimus, solennem videlicet gratiarum actionem, ex illo Christi praecepto. 1 Cor. xi. 26.

'2. Deinde, quod in ea conferrentur eleemosynae, ex instituto fortassis Apostoli, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Quae eleemosynae vocantur προσφοραὶ, ex illo Christi sermone, Matt. xxv. 20.

'3. Quod mortis Domini sacrificium, ob oculos quodammodo in illis mysteriis positum, veluti renovetur.' Beza, Quaest. et Respons. p. 105.

[a] See the testimonies in my Review, above, chap. xii. To which abundance more may be added. And note, that though the epithet 'spiri-

other pretended sacrifices, all material sacrifices [b], were mean, poor, contemptible things, in comparison. Such, I humbly conceive, ought to have been our constant, standing reply to the Romanists, with respect to this article: for we have certainly as just a plea for it in our case, as the ancient Fathers had in theirs. However, as I before hinted, Protestant Divines varied in their language on this head, some abiding by the old definitions, upon good consideration, others too unwarily departing from them. So now we are to consider them as divided into two sorts: and in process of time, as shall be related, sprang up a third sort, growing, as it were, out of the other two. I shall say something of each in their order and place, for the further clearing of the subject.

1. Among those that adhered to the old language, and still continued to call the Eucharist a true or a proper sacrifice, but of the spiritual kind, I may first mention Amandus Polanus [c],

tual,' joined, suppose, with 'meat,' or 'drink,' or the like, may denote some material thing bearing a mystical signification, yet it has not been shewn, neither can it be shewn, that the phrase 'spiritual sacrifice' anciently denoted a material substance offered as a sacrifice. A sacred regard was had to St. Peter's use of that phrase, to denote evangelical services: besides that the Fathers constantly explained what they meant by spiritual sacrifices, and so specified the particulars, as to leave no room for scruple or evasion, among persons of any reasonable discernment. So that the putting a new construction upon the phrase, in order to make some show of agreement with antiquity, is a transparent fallacy. It is keeping their terms, but eluding their meaning. It is teaching novel doctrine under ancient phrases.

[b] Express testimonies against material sacrifice may be seen in Justin Martyr, Apol. p. 14. Tertullian, p. 188. Rigalt. Origen. in Psalm. pp. 563, 722. ed. Bened. Lactantius, Epit. cap. lviii. p. 169. Eusebius, Praep. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 10. pp. 148, 149. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. pp. 39, 222, 223. Basil. tom. ii. pp. 402, 403. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. i. p. 664. ed. Bened. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. x. p. 345. Procopius in Isa. pp. 22, 493.

N.B. It is not possible to reconcile those testimonies to the material scheme: but it is very easy to make the Fathers consistent throughout, with themselves, and with each other, on the spiritual foot, as making the work, or service, the sacrifice. The single question then is, whether the Fathers ought to be so interpreted as to make them consistent upon the whole; or whether some detached passages, capable of a consistent meaning, ought to be understood in a sense repugnant to the uniform tenor of their writings. The passive sense is the true key to those passages.

[c] 'Coena Domini est sacrificium, tum eucharisticum, tum propitiatorium: eucharisticum quidem proprium, quatenus in ejus usu gratias Deo agimus quod nos ex servitute, &c. . . . propitiatorium vero aliquo

a learned Calvinist, who died in 1610. Our very judicious Dean Field, (who finished his book of the Church in 1610, and died in 1616,) he also adhered to the old language, disregarding the new definitions. He asserted the Eucharist to be, with regard to the sacrifices of our selves, our praises, &c. a true but spiritual sacrifice [d].

Scharpius, a learned Calvinist, who published his Cursus Theologicus in 1617, scrupled not to reckon the Eucharist among the sacrifices strictly and properly so called, but still of the eucharistical and spiritual kind. He had seen Bellarmine's affected subtilties on that head, despised them, and in part confuted them [e].

Bishop Andrews appears to have been a Divine of the same ancient stamp, in this article. In the year 1592, he discovered some uneasiness, that many would not allow the Eucharist to be a sacrifice at all, but a mere sacrament [f]. Afterwards, in 1610, he asserted the Lord's Supper to be a sacrifice, of the eucharistical kind [g]. In 1612, he went so far as to say, that the Apostle (1 Cor. x.) matcheth the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the Jews, and that, by the 'rule of comparisons, they must be ejusdem generis [h].' By which he did not mean, as some have widely mistaken him, that both must be the same kind of sacrifice, but that both must be of the sacrificial kind, agreeing in the same common genus of sacrifice: for he said it in opposition to those who pretended that the Eucharist was an ordinance merely of the sacramental kind, and not at all of the sacrificial [i].

modo, quatenus unici illius sacrificii vere propitiatorii memoriam in eo serio frequentare jubemur.' Amand. Polan. Symphon. Cathol. cap. xvii. p. 275. Cp. p. 855.

[d] Field, of the Church, pp. 210, 220.

[e] Scharpius, Curs. Theolog. pp. 1522, 1525, 1539. ed. 2. Genevae.

[f] Bp. Andrews's Sermons, part ii. p. 35.

[g] Andrews ad Bellarmin. Apolog. Respons. p. 184.

[h] Bp. Andrews's Sermons, p. 453. Cp. his Posthumous Answer to Card. Perron, pp. 6, 7.

[i] Besides the argument here drawn from the consideration of what principles he was then opposing, (which is a good rule of construction,) it may further be considered that the approved Divines of his time, Mason and Spalatensis, rejected with indignation the thought of any material sacrifice, (vid. Mason de Ministerio Anglican. pp. 575, 599, 618, 551, 595. Spalatensis, lib. v. pp. 149, 265, 267.) condemned it as absurdity,

Dr. Buckeridge wrote in 1614. His notion of the eucharistic sacrifice seems to resolve into a real and proper sacrifice of Christ's mystical body, the Church, and a metonymical, improper offering of Christ himself; offering him in some sort, or in the way of representation, like as is done in Baptism [k]. He does not indeed use the word 'proper,' following the style of the ancients before ever that word came in: but he apparently means it, where he speaks of the sacrifice of Christ's mystical body, that is, of self-sacrifice.

Archbishop Laud speaks of three sacrifices: 1. Christ's own sacrifice, commemorated before God, by the priest alone, in his breaking the bread, and pouring out the wine. 2. The sacrifice made by priest and people jointly, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. 3. Self-sacrifice by every communicant [l]. I will not defend all those distinctions. I think all the three sacrifices are properly the sacrifices of the Church, or of all the worthy communicants, recommended or offered up by their priests in that holy solemnity: the priest is their mouth in doing it, their conductor, or principal, authorized by God so to be. This great man said nothing of proper or improper: all the three sacrifices may be understood to be proper, but spiritual. What he believed, as to each, is not easy to say. If we explain his commemorative sacrifice by Bishop Buckeridge's account of the same thing, it could be no more than figurative, in that relative view;

madness, and impiety. So also Bp. Morton, (b. vi. cap. 5. pp. 438, 439.) approving what the wiser Romanists had said, condemning the notion in the like strong terms.

[k] 'De sacrificio cordis contriti ... de sacrificiis item corporis Christi mystici (non naturalis) in quo nosmetipsos Deo offerimus, satis convenit. ... De sacrificio item commemorativo, sive repraesentativo, quo Christus ipse, qui in cruce pro nobis immolatus est, per viam repraesentationis et commemorationis a nobis etiam quodammodo offerri dicitur, lis non magna est: in Baptismo enim offertur sacrificium Christi, uti Augustinus, &c.' Buckeridge de Potest. Papae in praefat.

[l] In the Eucharist we offer up to God three sacrifices: 'One, by the priest only, that is, the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out: another, by the priest and people jointly; and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ: the third, by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve him in both all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed upon him.' Laud's Conference, sect. xxxv. pp. 305, 306.

for we cannot properly sacrifice Christ himself: but the commemorative service, being of the same nature with hymns and praises, may be considered in the absolute view, as a proper sacrifice of ours, of the eucharistical and spiritual kind; and that perhaps was what that great Prelate might have in his thoughts.

It is certain that Bishop Montague, of that time, understood the whole action, or memorial service, to be a true and real sacrifice of praise [m]. And as he was a great admirer of antiquity, he had no regard to the new definitions, but referred the novelists to St. Austin for correction and better instruction [n]. The very learned Dr. Hammond was, undoubtedly, in the same way of thinking: the whole eucharistical action both of priest and people, the memorial service jointly performed, that was the sacrifice in his account [o]. Bishop Taylor [p], Archbishop Bramhall [q], Hamon l'Estrange [r], appear to have been in the like sentiments. Dr. Patrick, who wrote in 1659, more plainly followed the ancient way of thinking and speaking, such as had been in use before the new definitions came in. Duties and services were his sacrifice, a spiritual sacrifice [s]. He pleads, that such services justly deserve the name [t]; that even the Pagan Platonists (as well as Scripture and Fathers) had so used the name of Sacrifice; and that the appellation was very proper [u], taking in not only mental, or vocal praises, but manual also; that is, as he expresses it, the eucharistical actions [w]. Upon these principles, he tells the Papists, that 'we are sacrificers as well as they [x]:' which was

[m] Montacut. Origin. tom. ii. pp. 301–304. Compare his Antidiatribe, pp. 143, 144, where he takes in our self-sacrifice, calling it the sacrifice of Christ's mystical body.

[n] Montacut. ibid. p. 358.

[o] Hammond, Practical Catechism, lib. vi. sect. 4. vol. i. p. 174. Compare View of New Direct. p. 154. and vol. ii. Dispatch. p. 164. vol. iii. p. 769. The notion of the whole action being the sacrifice, was not new: it appears in the Fathers of old; and Mr. Perkins, who died in 1602, had taught the same. Problem, p. 137, or English Works, vol. ii. p. 550.

[p] Taylor, Holy Living, &c. ch. iv. sect. 10. Worthy Commun. p. 54.

[q] Bramhall's Works, pp. 35, 36, 996.

[r] L'Estrange's Alliance, &c. pp. 187, 221.

[s] Patrick's Mensa Mystica, pp. 16, 18, 19. ed. 4.

[t] Ibid. p. 35.

[u] Ibid. pp. 35, 36.

[w] Ibid. p. 36. ed. 4: compare p. 19.

[x] Ibid. p. 37: compare pp. 38, 40.

the right turn, copied from what the ancient Fathers had said in answer to the like charge of having no sacrifice, and as justly pleaded by Protestants now, as by Christians then, against their injurious accusers.

Bishop Lany, after the Restoration, (A. D. 1663,) a very learned Divine, and of great acumen, scrupled not to call the whole eucharistical service true and proper sacrifice, proper without a metaphor, as being the fittest gift or present that could be offered to the Divine Majesty[y]. So little did he regard the frivolous distinctions of the Trent Council, or the new definitions invented to support them.

Nine years after appeared Dr. Brevint[z]. He was well read in the eucharistic sacrifice: no man understood it better; which may appear sufficiently from two tracts of his upon the subject, small ones both, but extremely fine. He stood upon the ancient ground, looked upon evangelical duties as the true oblations and sacrifices[a], resolved the sacrifice of the Eucharist, actively considered, solely into them[b]; and he explained the practical uses of that doctrine in so clear, so lively, and so affecting a way, that one shall scarce meet with anything on the subject that can be justly thought to exceed it, or even to come up to it[c]. So that I could heartily join my wishes with a late learned writer, that that 'excellent little book, entitled, The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, might be reprinted, for the honour of God, and

N.B. I have omitted Mr. Thorndike, because his notion plainly resolves into the passive sense, viz. into the grand sacrifice itself, as contained in the Eucharist, because represented, applied, and participated in it. The Lutherans, generally, resolve it the same way, only differing as to the point of real or local presence. Vide Brochmand, tom. iii. pp. 2072, 3052.

[y] Bishop Lany's Sermon on Heb. xiii. 15. pp. 16, 32. Compare my Review, above, p. 318.

[z] In 1672, Dr. Brevint wrote the Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass: reprinted 1673. In 1673, he published the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. He was made Dean of Lincoln in 1681, and died in 1695.

[a] Brevint, Depth and Myst. p. 16.

[b] 'Sincere Christians must have their hands full, at the receiving the holy Communion, with four distinct sorts of sacrifices. 1. The sacramental and commemorative sacrifice of Christ. 2. The real and actual sacrifice of themselves. 3. The free-will offering of their goods. 4. The peace-offering of their praises.' Brevint, Christian Sacrifice, 110, 111.

[c] Brevint, Sacram. and Sacrif. sect. vi. vii. viii. pp. 74–134.

the benefit of the Church [d].' It is worth the noting, how acutely Dr. Brevint distinguished between the sacramental sacrifice of Christ, and the real or actual sacrifice of ourselves. We cannot properly sacrifice Christ: we can only do it in signs and figures, that is, improperly, or commemoratively: but we may properly offer up ourselves to God; and that is, in strict propriety of speech, our sacrifice, our spiritual sacrifice. Dr. Brevint rejected, with disdain, any thought of a material sacrifice, a bread offering, or a wine offering; tartly ridiculing the pretences commonly made for it [e]. But I have dwelt long enough upon the Divines of the first class; who standing upon the old principles, and disregarding the new definitions, continued to call the Eucharist a true sacrifice, or a proper sacrifice, (meaning eucharistical and spiritual,) or forbore, at least, to call it improper, or metaphorical.

2. I may now look back to other Divines, who used a different language in this article.

At the head of them [f] stands the celebrated Mr. Hooker, who wrote in 1597, and who feared not to say, that 'sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry,' and that we have, 'properly, now no sacrifice [g].' I presume he meant by proper sacrifice, propitiatory, according to the sense of the Trent Council, or of the new definitions. In such a sense as that, he might justly say, that sacrifice is no part of the Church ministry, or that the

[d] Dr. Hickes's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. Prefat. Disc. pp. 39, 40.

[e] 'Now among these magnificent wonders of Christ's law, bread and wine can be reputed but of little importance; which you may find as well or better among the oblations of Aaron, and thus far belonging better to his order; because he is often commanded to offer bread, which Priest Melchizedek is not. Therefore, if offering bread and wine makes an order, Aaron will be more certainly a priest after the order of Melchizedek, than was either Melchizedek or Christ himself.' Brevint, Depth and Mystery, p. 116. See p. 117.

[f] Dr. Rainoldes, in 1584, had in the way of arguing 'ad hominem' shewn, that the Fathers were no friends to the mass-sacrifice, considered as true and proper, inasmuch as they allowed only of spiritual sacrifices, which, in the Romish account, were not true or proper sacrifices. See Rainoldes against Harte, pp. 472, 535, 536, 539. That kind of arguing first led the way to such sort of language as Mr. Hooker made use of; but was not precisely the same with it, not running in the like absolute terms.

[g] Hooker, Eccl. Polity, book v. ch. 78. sect. 2. Oxf. edit.

Christian Church has no sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such new language, be the meaning ever so right: the Fathers never used it[h].

Dr. Francis White, in the year 1617, (he was afterwards Bishop of Ely,) observed, that the name of sacrifice doth not in a proper and univocal sense belong to the Eucharist, but in a large acceptation of the word, and in a figurative meaning; because it is a representation of the real sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the cross[i]. He was so far right, in making a representation of Christ's sacrifice to be but figuratively that sacrifice: but he forgot, that the Eucharist contains many spiritual services, which are truly sacrifices in the Scripture language, and that even the memorial service, though it is but metonymically Christ's sacrifice, is yet really our sacrifice, our spiritual sacrifice. From hence, however, may be seen how and by what degrees Protestant Divines came to leave off calling the Eucharist a sacrifice, or called it so with the epithet of 'improper' or 'figurative.' It was chiefly owing to a partial conception of it: they considered it barely in its representative or relative view, and too hastily concluded, that since it was not the sacrifice represented, (as the Romanists pretended it was,) it was no sacrifice at all in propriety of speech.

Spalatensis, of that time, made no scruple of saying, over and over, that the Eucharist is 'not a true sacrifice[k].' In a certain place, he expressed himself in such a manner as might be apt to surprise a man at the first reading: he says, that the name of true sacrifice was never given to the Eucharist, never thought on, before the very latest and the most corrupt ages[l]. But he meant it, I suppose, according to that sense of true sacrifice,

[h] Once Clemens Alexandrinus, (Str. vii. p. 836.) and once Arnobius, (lib. vii.) has said, that the Christians had no sacrifices; meaning such as the Pagans had boasted of: but that did not amount to saying, that the Church had no proper sacrifices, or properly no sacrifice.

[i] White, Orthodox Faith and Way, p. 339.

[k] Antonius de Dominis, lib. v. c. 6. pp. 82, 265, 269, 271, 278.

[l] 'Esse verum sacrificium, nunquam ad postrema corrupta saecula invenio, aut dictum, aut cogitatum, aut traditum, aut practicatum in Ecclesia.' Antonius de Dominis, ibid. p. 281.

which the Trent Council and the Popish writers had lately affixed to the name.

The Divinity chairs in both universities, about that time, concurred in denying the Eucharist to be a true, real, or proper sacrifice: which appears from Dr. Abbot [m], afterwards Bishop of Sarum; and from Dr. Davenant [n], afterwards Bishop of the same see. Both of them seemed to take their estimate of true and proper sacrifice from the new definitions; allowing them for argument sake, and joining issue with the Romanists upon their own terms. The like may be said of Mr. Mason, who frequently allows, or declares, that the Eucharist is not a sacrifice properly so called [o]. But Dr. Crakanthorp (about A.D. 1624) may serve for a good comment upon all the rest: for when he denied the Eucharist to be either a true sacrifice, or a sacrifice properly so called, he cautiously guarded what he had said, by restraining it to such a sense as the Trent Council and Romish divines had affixed to the phrases of true sacrifice, and sacrifice properly so called [p]. That restriction, or salvo, was often forgot, and came, by degrees, to be more and more omitted; and so the most prevailing doctrine ran in absolute terms, that the Eucharist is no true sacrifice, or no proper sacrifice, or in short, no sacrifice. Bishop Morton, being sensible how much it tended to disparage the holy Eucharist, and how contradictory it was to ancient language, to say that the Eucharist is not a true or not a proper

[m] 'The passion of Christ is the sacrifice which we offer: and because the passion of Christ is not now really acted, therefore the sacrifice which we offer is no true and real sacrifice.' Abbot, Counterproof against Dr. Bishop, ch. xiv. p. 364. N.B. Here was the like partial conception of the thing as I before noted in Dr. White.

[n] 'Nos asserimus, in missa nihil posse nominari aut ostendi quod sit sacrificabile, aut quod rationem et essentiam habeat realis, externi, et proprie dicti sacrificii: quamvis quae adhiberi in eadem solent preces, eleemosynae, gratiarum actiones, spiritualium sacrificiorum nomen sortiantur; quamvis etiam ipsa repraesentatio fracti corporis Christi et fusi sanguinis, figurate sacrificium a veteribus saepenumero vocetur.' Davenant. Determinat. p. 13.

[o] Mason. de Minist. Anglic. pp. 549, 550, 551, 555, 627, 628.

[p] 'Sacrificium missae non est vere sacrificium propitiatorium, ut concilium Tridentinum definit, vestrique docent; sed Eucharisticum tantummodo et commemorativum. . . . Sed nec omnino verum et proprie dictum sacrificium in missa ullum est; non quale Tridentinum concilium definivit, et vestri uno ore profitentur.' Crakanthorp. contr. Spalatens. c. lxxiv. p. 574.

sacrifice, endeavoured to help the matter by a distinction between truth of excellency and truth of propriety [q]; allowing the Eucharist to be true sacrifice, as to excellency of nature, but not as to propriety of speech: as if the new definitions were a better rule of propriety, than all that had prevailed for fifteen hundred years before. His distinction was a good one, in the main, but was not justly applied in this particular, where truth of excellency and truth of propriety are really coincident, and resolve both into one. However, so the vogue ran, as I have before said, and so has it been transmitted, through many hands, down to this day [r].

3. Such being the case, there is the less reason to wonder that a third set of Divines, in process of time, sprang up, as it were, out of the two former. For some serious men perceiving how much the ancient and modern language differed in this article, and that by means of the now prevailing definitions they were

[q] Morton's Institut. of the Sacram. book vi. chap. 3. p. 415. chap. 7. sect. i. p. 470.

How much the old notion of sacrifice was now wearing out may be judged from Dr. George Hakewill, who wrote in 1641, and was otherwise a learned and judicious writer, particularly as to this very argument. He says, 'Commemoration being an action, cannot, in propriety of speech, be the thing sacrificed, which must of necessity be a substance,' &c. Hakewill, Dissertat. p. 25.

He rejects Austin's definition, p. 4. And it is too plain from several places of his work, that the mists first raised by Bellarmine, and other Romish divines, hung before his eyes.

[r] The Lutheran way of speaking, in this matter, may be seen in Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. p. 291. and in Zeltner. Breviar. Controvers. cum Eccl. Graec. pp. 231, 251.

The Calvinistical way, in Dallaeus, de Cult. Religiosis. pp. 1122, 1126. L'Arroque, Hist. of the Eucharist, 275, &c. Basnage, Annal. tom. i. p. 373, all declare it, absolutely, no true sacrifice: which, though well meant, is too unguarded, and is different language from that of the Fathers of the Reformation.

One of our late Divines (a person of great learning) speaks thus:

'We deny that there is any reason why the Eucharist should be called a true sacrifice, and properly so called, or ought to be so: for when we call anything a true sacrifice, we have regard to the formal reason of a sacrifice, and not to the final.' Nichols's Additional Notes, p. 51, printed A.D. 1710.

But what did he make the formal reason of a sacrifice? Did he take it from the new definitions? Where there is properly a gift to God, by way of worship, to honour, or to please him, there is the formal reason of a sacrifice. Gratulatory sacrifice is as properly sacrifice, as the propitiatory, or expiatory: they are different species under the same genus.

likely to lose their sacrifice; they thought of reconciling the eucharistic sacrifice with the new definitions, by making it a material sacrifice. Our excellent Mr. Mede, in the year 1635, was chief in this scheme. The aim was good, to retrieve the Christian sacrifice, which seemed to be almost sinking; but the measures were ill laid: for the only right way, as I conceive, of compassing what he intended, would have been to have restored the old definitions of sacrifice, and so to have set the Eucharist upon its true, and ancient, that is, spiritual foundation. The endeavouring to fix it on a material foot, and to make the elements themselves a sacrifice, was no more than what had been attempted, about fourscore years before, by the Romanists [s], and, after mature deliberation, had been justly exploded by the shrewder men [t], as Jewish, or meaner than Jewish, and altogether repugnant to Christian principles. Neither could Mr. Mede escape the censures of many of that time for what he was doing; as appears by a letter of Dr. Twisse, written in 1636, and since printed in Mede's Works [u]. Mr. Mede forbore however to print his Christian Sacrifice; though he published the appendage to it, concerning the altar, which might give least offence: the rest appeared not till ten years after his decease, in the year 1648. There are many good things in it, for which reason it has generally been mentioned with respect by our best Divines: but in the point of a material sacrifice, (a sacrifice of the elements,) he had not many followers. Dr. Heylin, who in 1636 and 1637 had some scheme or schemes of his own [w], seems to have taken into Mr. Mede's in or before 1654, when he published his exposition of the Apostles' Creed [x].

[s] Ruardus Tapper. contr. Luther. art. 18. Gaspar. Casalius. De Sacrif. lib. i. c. 20. Jansenius, Concord. Evang. p. 905. Gordon. Huntlaeus, lib. ix. c. 3. n. 1.

[t] Salmeron. tom. ix. tract. 29. p. 224. Maldonate, de Sacr. tom. i. par. 3. p. 334. Bellarmine, pp. 788, 792, 793. Vasquez, tom. iii. p. 527. Suarez, tom. iii. pp. 886, 905, 906, 910. Gregor. de Valentia, tom. iv. p. 1274. Baptista Scortia. de Missa, 34, 36, 38. Arcudius, pp. 187, 189.

[u] 'I perceive, the main thing you reached after, was a certain mystery concerning a sacrifice; which the Papists have miserably transformed; but, in your sense, is nowadays become a mystery to all the Christian world.' Twisse, Ep. 70. Compare Mede's Answer, Ep. 71.

[w] In his Coal from the Altar, and in his Antidotum.

[x] Heylin on the Creed, p. 240, &c.

There are two fundamental flaws in Mr. Mede's system: 1. One in his endeavouring to fix the notion or definition of a Christian sacrifice by the rules of the Levitical; as if typical and true were the same thing. 2. The other, in not being able to make out the sacrifice he aimed at, by the very rules which himself had fixed for it. He observed very justly, that in the Levitical peace offerings, God had, as it were, his part, portion, or mess, assigned in the sacrifice [y], or feast: (for God was considered in those feasts, not merely as Convivator, but as Conviva also; a necessary circumstance to complete the federal oblation and federal feast.) But when he came to make out the analogy between the Jewish and Christian feast, he could find no part or portion for God in the Eucharist; where we take all to ourselves [z]. There the parallel failed; the rule would not answer: therefore the rule was wrong. It would be trifling here to reply, that a Christian sacrifice is no Jewish one, and is therefore not to be measured by Jewish rules: for why then should a Christian sacrifice be made material by Jewish rules? or why is the definition of sacrifice measured by the same? Either uniformly hold to the rule assigned, or else give it up as no rule; and then the Christian sacrifice may be a true and proper sacrifice, (though spiritual only,) being of a different kind from the Jewish ones. If, indeed, the Eucharist could be proved to be a material sacrifice by any clear text of Old Testament or New, then there would remain no further room for dispute: but since the point is chiefly argued from its supposed analogy to other material

[y] Mede's Christian Sacrifice, book ii. c. 7. pp. 370, 371.

[z] Luther first took notice of the self-contradiction contained in the making the elements a proper sacrifice to God in the Eucharist.

'Totum ergo cur nos panem, et vinum totum comedimus et bibimus, nihil relinquentes Deo? . . . Dum corpora nostra et laudes sacrificamus, nihil nobis, sed omnia Deo soli exhibemus, ut stet ratio sacrificii etiam spiritualis. Totum nos voramus, et totum offerimus: hoc est tantum dicere; neque voramus si offerimus, neque offerimus si voramus: et ita dum utrumque facimus, neutrum facimus. Quis audivit unquam talia? Omnia sibi pugnantissime contradicunt, et invicem sese consumunt: aut necessario et infallibiliter concludunt Eucharistiam sacrificium esse non posse. Diluant haec, rogo, Lovanienses et Parisienses.' Luth. de abrogand. Missa privata, tom. ii. par. 2. fol. 255. Several answers have been thought on, to elude this argument, by Romanists and others: but it is impossible to invent any that will bear.

sacrifices, (Jewish or Pagan,) and that analogy does not answer, but fails in the main thing belonging to all material sacrifices, and which alone should make them appear gifts to God; it is plain that the argument has an essential flaw in it, which no art can cure.

One thing may be pertinently observed of Mr. Mede, that he confined the sacrifice to the ante-oblation. His was a sacrifice of the unconsecrated bread and wine [a], not of the consecrated; not of the body and blood. He supposed no new sacrificing act in the post-oblation, but the representation only of Christ's sacrifice, made by what had been sacrificed before. So that some late notions of the eucharistic sacrifice can claim but very little countenance from Mr. Mede. What we call offering the elements for consecration, (like as we offer the waters of Baptism,) he called sacrificing; which was indeed calling it by a wrong name, and upon wrong principles: but, in other things, his notion of the Eucharist was much the same with the common one; and he went not those strange lengths, those unwarrantable excesses, which, I am sorry to say, some late schemes manifestly abound with. But I proceed.

The doctrine of a material sacrifice, first brought hither about 1635, barely subsisted till the Restoration, and afterwards slept, as it were, for thirty or forty years. But in 1697, two queries being sent to a learned man [b], in these terms, 'Whether there ought to be a true and real sacrifice in the Church; and Whether there is any such thing in the Church of England,' (both which might very safely have been answered in the affirmative, keeping to the terms wherein they were stated,) that learned person chose to alter the terms, true and real, into material, and still answered in the affirmative: which was going too far. Nevertheless, in his answer to the queries, he admitted of some spiritual sacrifices,

[a] 'Thus was there, as it were, a mutual commerce between God and the people; the people giving unto God, and God again unto his people: the people giving a small thanksgiving, but receiving a great blessing; offering bread, but receiving the body; offering wine, but receiving the mystical blood of Christ Jesus.' Mede's Disc. li. p. 293. Comp. Christian Sacrif. chap. viii.

[b] Dr. Hickes, in Two Discourses, p. 51, &c. 61. printed 1732.

as being true, and real, and proper sacrifices; which makes it the more surprising that he should think of any other sacrifice. For since it is self-evident that truth of excellency goes along with the spiritual sacrifices, and since he himself had allowed truth of propriety to go along with the same, or with some of them at least; to what purpose could it be to seek out for another sacrifice, not more proper, but certainly less excellent, than what we had before? It is an uncontestable maxim, that the value of a sacrifice can never rise higher than the value of the sacrificers[c]; and therefore if they sacrifice themselves, it is not possible that they should do more, because in the giving themselves, they give all that they have to give. What dignity then, or value, could it add to an evangelical priesthood, or sacrifice, to present the Divine Majesty with a loaf of bread, or a chalice of wine? or what practical ends or uses could be served by it? I shall only observe further, that the same learned writer, afterwards, took material thing into the very definition of sacrifice[d]: but upon the latest correction, he struck it out again, putting gift instead of it[e]; thereby leaving room for spiritual sacrifice (which undoubtedly is a gift) to be as proper a sacrifice as any. So that his first and his last thoughts upon the subject appear to have been conformable so far, in a critical point, upon which much depends.

Another learned writer (a zealous materialist, if ever there was one) laid it down for his groundwork, that nothing can properly be called a sacrifice except some material thing: but to save himself the trouble of proving it, he was pleased to aver, that it was given for granted[f]. It might reasonably be asked,

[c] Vid. Peter Martyr. Loc. Commun. pp. 753, 895. Field on the Church, p. 209. Cornel. a Lapide, in Heb. vii. 7, seems to allow this maxim, when he says, 'In omni sacrificio sacerdos major est sua victima quam offert.'

[d] Hickes's Christian Priesthood, p. 74. ed. 2. A.D. 1707. 'A sacrifice is a material thing solemnly brought, or presented, and offered to any God, according to the rites of any religion,' &c.

[e] Hickes's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. p. 159. A.D. 1711. 'A sacrifice is a gift brought, and solemnly offered by a priest, ordinary or extraordinary, according to the rites and observances of any religion, in, before, at, or upon any place, unto any God, to honour and worship him, and thereby to acknowledge him to be God and Lord.'

[f] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 5. ed. 1714, or p. 6. ed. 1724.

when given, or by whom? Not by the penmen of the Old or New Testament; not by the Christian Fathers, or Pagan Platonists, in their times: not by the Schoolmen down to the Reformation, nor by the Papists themselves, generally, before the Council of Trent: not by any considerable number of Protestants, till fifty years after, or more; never by the Divines of our Church, without contradiction and opposition from other Divines as wise and as learned as any we have had: not given for granted, even by Dr. Hickes, of the material side, in 1697 [g]; no, nor in 1711, as hath been already hinted. To be short then, that important point was rather taken than given for granted, by one writer who wanted a foundation to build a new system upon: and as the foundation itself was weak, the superstructure, of course, must fall, however curiously wrought, or aptly compacted, had it really been so.

But it is time for me now, my Reverend Brethren, to relieve your patience, by drawing to a conclusion. I have pointed out (so far as I have been able to judge, upon very serious and diligent inquiry) the original ground and source of all the confusion which has arisen in this argument. The changing the old definitions for new ones has perplexed us: and now again, the changing the new ones for the old may set us right. Return we but to the ancient ideas of spiritual sacrifice, and then all will be clear, just, and uniform. We need not then be vainly searching for a sacrifice (as the Romanists have been before us) among texts that speak nothing of one, from Melchizedek in Genesis down to Hebrews the thirteenth. Our proofs will be found to lie where the

[g] His words are: 'Vocal sacrifices are commonly called spiritual. ... These are true, real sacrifices ... and therefore our Saviour is said to have offered them up, Heb. v. 7. and they are expressly called sacrifices, Heb. xiii. 15. and 1 Pet. ii. 5.' Two Disc. p. 53. 'The sacrifice of praises and prayers unto God ... is a proper, but spiritual sacrifice.' p. 61.

N.B. It appears to me, that Dr. Hickes's original scheme of the Christian sacrifice (though he called it material) really meant no more than an oblation of the material elements for consecration, (which certainly is no sacrifice,) and a commemorative service performed by the material elements, an external, manual service, as opposed to mere mental or vocal: both which points might have been granted him, as not amounting to the sacrifice of any material substance, the point in question.

spiritual services lie, and where they are called sacrifices. The Eucharist contains many of them, and must therefore be a proper sacrifice, in the strength of those texts, and cannot be otherwise. Here the primitive Fathers rested that matter; and here may we rest it, as upon firm ground. Let us not presume to offer the Almighty any dead sacrifice in the Eucharist; he does not offer us empty signs: but as he conveys to us the choicest of his blessings by those signs, so by the same signs (not sacrifices) ought we to convey our choicest gifts, the Gospel services, the true sacrifices, which he has commanded. So will the federal league of amity be mutually kept up and perfected. Our sacrifices will then be magnificent, and our priesthood glorious; our altar high and heavenly, and our Eucharist a constant lesson of good life; every way fitted to draw down from above those inestimable blessings which we so justly expect from it. Let but the work or service be esteemed the sacrifice, rather than the material elements, and then there will be no pretence or colour left for absurdly supposing, that any sacrifice of ours can be expiatory, or more valuable than ourselves; or that our hopes of pardon, grace, and salvation can depend upon any sacrifice extrinsic, save only the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ. When once those foreign fictions, or fancies, of other extrinsic sin offerings or expiations are removed, there will be no error of asserting a proper eucharistic sacrifice; but many good practical uses will be served by it.

Under the legal economy, bulls and goats, sheep and turtle-doves, bread offerings and wine offerings were really sacrifices: they had legal expiations (shadows of true) annexed to them; to intimate, that true expiation then, and always, must depend solely on the true sacrifice of atonement, the sacrifice of the cross. The shadows have since disappeared; and now it is our great Gospel privilege to have immediate access to the true sacrifice, and to the true expiations, without the intervention of any legal expiation or legal sacrifice. To imagine any expiatory sacrifice now to stand between us and the great sacrifice, is to keep us still at a distance, when we are allowed to draw near: it is dishonouring the grace of the Gospel; and, in short, is a flat contradiction to

both Testaments. For the rule of both is, and the very nature of things shews that so it must be, that all true expiation must resolve solely, directly, and immediately, into the one true sacrifice of expiation, namely, the grand sacrifice. If, indeed, we had now any legal or typical offences to expiate, then might bread and wine be to us an expiatory typical sacrifice, as before to the Jews; and that would be all. If we look for anything higher, they have it not in them, neither by their own virtue, nor by any they can borrow: for it is no more possible that the blood of the grape, representing Christ's blood, should purge the conscience, and take away sins now, than that the blood of bulls or of goats, representing the same blood of Christ, could do it aforetime. The utmost that any material sacrifices, by virtue of the grand sacrifice, could ever do, was only to make some legal or temporal atonement: they cannot do so much now, because the legal economy is out of doors, and all things are become new. In a word, our expiations now are either spiritual or none: and therefore such of course must our sacrifices also be, either spiritual or none at all.

THE APPENDIX.

As I have hinted something above[a] of the strange lengths which have been run, and of the unwarrantable excesses which some late systems of the eucharistic sacrifice manifestly abound with; it may reasonably be expected that I should here give some account of what I there intimated. I must own, it is the most unwelcome part of my employ, and what I least wished to be concerned in. It can never be any pleasure to a good mind to be exposing failings, even when there is a necessity for it; but it is rather an abatement of the solid satisfaction arising from the maintaining of the truth, that it cannot ordinarily be done without some kind of rebuke, open or tacit, upon every gainsayer. When I first engaged in the subject of the Eucharist, I saw what necessity there was for throwing off the material hypothesis, (being unscriptural, and uncatholic, and many ways unreasonable,) lest it should hang like a millstone upon the neck of the main cause. Nevertheless, I endeavoured to remove that weight with all imaginable tenderness towards persons, living or dead; designing only to rectify mistakes, in a manner the most respectful, so as not to betray the cause of truth. What I could not approve of, in a late learned writer, I expressed my dislike of, where necessary, in the softest terms; scarce noting the deformities of his system in any explicit way, but wrapping them up in generals, and throwing the kindest shade over them. But by what has appeared since, I find, that every degree of tenderness and every token of respect must be looked upon as nothing, unless I could have commended the same writer, as a person of sound judgment[b], in the very things wherein he certainly judged amiss,

[a] Page 440.

[b] See Dr. Brett's Remarks on Review, p. 97, and compare pp. 1, 121, 123, 156.

and much to the prejudice of those important truths which I had undertaken to defend. A very particular stress is laid upon that gentleman's solid learning and judgment in this very question: he was, it seems, visibly superior in learning and argument to all opposers [c]; insomuch that a most eminent person, in 1716, had not the courage to contradict him, however disposed to it, in the article of the sacrifice [d]. I have no inclination to detract from that gentleman's talents: though the proper glory of a man lies not in the possession, but in the right use of them. Admiration of persons has often been found a false guide in our searches after truth. Very great men have frequently been observed to run into great excesses: and I doubt not but to make it appear that he did so in the article now before us. Men must, at last, be tried by truth, (which is above everything,) and not truth by men, or by names [e]. That I may observe some method, I shall point out the excesses which that learned writer appears to have run into, under the heads here following:—

1. In depreciating spiritual sacrifices beyond what was decent or just.

2. In overvaluing material sacrifices.

3. In overstraining many things relating to our Lord's supposed sacrifice in the Eucharist.

4. In overturning or undermining the sacrifice of the cross.

5. In the wrong stating of our sacrifice in the Eucharist.

[c] 'Mr. Johnson's books had given great offence to many in the highest stations in this Church. Dr. Hancock, Dr. Wise, and Dr. Turner, and some others were encouraged to answer him; but they were all found to be too weak to be any of them, or all together, a match for a man of his solid learning and judgment: he was visibly their superior in learning and argument, and their faint essays served but to raise his reputation.' Brett's Remarks on Review, p. 122.

[d] 'This eminent person, whoever he was, (for Mr. Johnson does not name him,) and who was least expected to favour the doctrine of the sacrifice, had not the courage to deny it to be one.' Brett, ibid.

The design, I suppose, of that eminent person, was not to enter into the debate at all, but only to suggest an healing thought, viz. that since every thing of moment was perfectly secure without the material hypothesis, there could be no good reason left for the warmth that was shewn in it. A wise reflection: which ought to have been thankfully received, and seriously attended to.

[e] See my Importance, &c. Works, vol. iii. p. 667.

6. In giving erroneous accounts of the Evangelical or Christian priesthood.

These several heads may furnish out so many distinct chapters: I shall take them in the order as they lie, and shall proceed as far in them as necessity may seem to require, or my present leisure may permit; reserving the rest for any future occasion, according as circumstances may appear.

CHAP. I.

Shewing some Excesses of the new Scheme, in depreciating spiritual Sacrifices.

I. I MADE mention before of Mr. Johnson's taking it for granted, that spiritual sacrifice cannot be sacrifice properly so called[f]: which was throwing off a very important question too negligently, and forbidding it a fair hearing.

II. Elsewhere he maintains, that 'it is impossible in the nature of things, that prayer and praise without sacrifice' (he meant material sacrifice) 'can be better than with it[g].' I pass by the pretence offered in support of this paradox; because it is an old one, borrowed from the Romanists: and it was solidly confuted long ago, by our very learned and judicious Mr. Mason[h]. I shall only note further, that the author might as justly have said, that it is impossible for uncircumcision to be better than circumcision, because he who receives circumcision as he ought must of course have the true circumcision of the heart, and both must needs be better than none.

III. Another the like paradox is, that 'prayer and praise are absurdly preferred to material sacrifices[i].' Much might be said in confutation of this assertion, both from Scripture and antiquity: but I consult brevity; besides that the bare mentioning

[f] See above, p. 441. I forgot to take Grotius into my list above; who says, 'Eleemosynae et jejunia et res similes sunt sacrae actiones, et quidem externae; ideoque cum fiunt ex fide in Christum, sunt sacrificia novi foederis, etiam talia per quae Deus nobis redditur propitius.' Grot. Vot. pro Pace, p. 670. Cp. 715.

[g] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 123.

[h] Mason de Min. Anglic. p. 585.

[i] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 127.

such things is sufficient to expose them. I shall only ask, how came material incense to be laid aside, and naked prayer to be preferred before it, as proper to the saints, under the Gospel[k]? Incense was symbolical prayer; prayer is the evangelical incense, and as much preferable to the other, as truth is to shadow, or thing signified to the sign or figure of it.

IV. To disparage spiritual sacrifice yet further, he says, 'A contrite spirit is called a sacrifice by David, though it be no more than a disposition of mind fitting us for devotion and humiliation, and may prevail with God when no real [viz. material] sacrifice is to be had[l].' An unseemly reflection upon what are emphatically called the sacrifices of God, in that very place[m], as vastly preferable to material sacrifices. The Psalmist did not mean, when material sacrifice was not to be had: for in the verse immediately preceding he says, 'Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering[n].' What could be said plainer, to shew the preference of the spiritual sacrifices above all other?

V. The author goes on in the same strain: 'Whatever is now said of prayer without sacrifice, it is certain, that it is but mere synagogue worship[o].' It is certain that such prayer is the worship of the saints, under the Gospel, as I before noted. But, I presume, this ingenious turn was thought on to anticipate or to retort the charge of Judaism; which may justly be objected to material sacrifices, and frequently has been. It is odd to speak of public prayer without sacrifice, when such prayer is itself a Christian sacrifice: but he meant prayer without a material sacrifice; that, in his account, is mere synagogue worship. He forgot, that it runs in Christ's name.

VI. Another position is, that 'a sacrifice of righteousness signifies a noble or rich sacrifice, such as it was proper for King David to offer[p].' But learned men have well shewn, that

[k] Revel. v. 8. Cp. Irenaeus, lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249.

[l] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 128.

[m] Psalm li. 17.

[n] The pretences made for changing the translation, in order to elude the sense, (p. 131,) appear so forced and unnatural, as not to deserve a serious confutation.

[o] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 128.

[p] Johnson, ibid. p. 130.

it signifies true and spiritual sacrifice[q], as opposed to material, typical, symbolical: and such spiritual sacrifice is really richer and nobler than an hecatomb. I am aware that something may be speciously pleaded from Psalm li. 19: and Mr. Johnson makes his use of it[r]. But the learned Vitringa seems to me to have given a just account of that whole matter[s].

VII. To disparage spiritual sacrifices yet more, and to give the reader as low and contemptible an idea of them as possible, they are compared with the wood offerings[t] mentioned in Nehemiah[u]; the fuel brought for the use of the sacrifices: and it is thereupon observed, that 'the Jews of old hoped, as well as other people, by their sweet-scented cane and wood, to render their sacrifice a more agreeable service[w].' A coarse comparison! Had not the author otherwise bore the character of a grave and serious writer, one could not have taken this extraordinary thought to proceed from any reverent regard towards spiritual sacrifices, the sacrifices of God. However, we may perceive from hence, that as often as any one should have objected the meanness of a loaf offering, or a wine offering, he was provided with an answer, and prepared to retort.

VIII. I shall take notice but of one article more, under this head. It was a famous topic among the Christian Fathers, when arguing for spiritual sacrifices, that spiritual offerings were most agreeable to spiritual beings[x], such as God, and the souls of men: the same argument has been as justly urged by learned moderns. But in order to break the force of it, it is observed, that Porphyry of old, and the Quakers of late days, have carried those reasonings too far, in the spiritualizing way[y]. Be it so: may not wise men know where to stop? Has not external religion been oftener and more grievously perverted, and carried into

[q] See Vitringa, de Vet. Synagog. p. 65. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 499. In Isa. tom. ii. pp. 56, 733. 829.

[r] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 130.

[s] Vitringa in Isa. tom. ii. p. 733.

[t] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 225.

[u] Nehem. x. 34; xiii. 31.

[w] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 225.

[x] Tertullian. de Orat. c. xxvii. xxviii. See Review, above, p. 331. Lactantii Epit. c. lviii. p. 169. De ver. Cult. lib. vi. c. 24, 25.

[y] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 127.

extremes? We know what superstitions and dangerous deceits arose from the use of material incense in the Eucharist[z], by the making it an offering for sin[a]: neither have we reason to expect anything better from the bringing in a material mincha, for the like purposes, into the Christian Church.

However, this way of depreciating internal religion and spiritual sacrifice is not the way to promote the prime uses, the practical ends and purposes of the holy Communion. It is indeed said on the other hand, in the way of apology, that they 'do not at all lessen the value of any internal grace, or the necessity of a pious life,' but the contrary[b]. They do not mean it, I easily believe: but in fact they do it. For every cool, considering man must see, that those low notions of spiritual sacrifice (very different from the elevated ideas which Scripture and Catholic antiquity everywhere inculcate) can have no good aspect upon practical religion. As to the pretence of 'raising the dignity of the Sacrament[c],' by a material sacrifice, it is marvellous that any man of moderate discernment can entertain such a thought: for the reverse is the certain truth. The dignity of the holy Sacrament must infallibly suffer, if so mean, so unprimitive a sacrifice should ever be admitted into it. The ancients constantly preserved the dignity of the Eucharist, by supporting the dignity of spiritual sacrifices: if moderns will submit to learn of them, they will use the same effectual methods, often proved and tried.

CHAP. II.

Shewing the EXCESSES *of the new Scheme, in* OVERVALUING *material Sacrifices.*

I. IT is alleged, that 'there is more intrinsic value in a loaf of bread and a flagon of wine, than in all the gold and silver

[z] Vid. Renaudotius, Collect. Liturg. tom. i. 201.

[a] Jacob. Liturg. pp. 38, 53. ed. Fabric. Marci Liturg. 261. 273. Ordo Commun. Renaud. tom. ii. pp. 4, 6, 18, 19. Mozarab. Miss. in Martene, tom. i. pp. 470, 498. Dionys. Missal. ibid. p. 519. Prudent. Pontif. ibid. 528. Maysacens. Missal. ibid. 538. Compare, 591, 601.

[b] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 283, alias p. 288. Brett's Remarks on Review, p. 139.

[c] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 283.

in the Indies; because the former will for some time support our lives, the other cannot do it of itself, but only as by the consent of men, it has a value set upon it[d].' Upon which I observe, 1. That the argument proves too much: for, by the same argument, a flask of air would have more intrinsic value than all the rest put together; since air is absolutely necessary to support life, which none of the rest are. 2. The author observes elsewhere, that bloody sacrifices, in themselves, are of the nobler sort[e]; that is, have more intrinsic value: and yet David (a very wise and good man) disdained to offer even such to God, if they were to cost him nothing[f]. He measured the value of the sacrifice by the self-denial, the respect, and the affection of the offerer, shewn in part by the costliness of the offering. And indeed, when God did require material sacrifices at all, he required costly ones, of as many as could afford it. But what do our bread and wine cost a whole congregation? What the communicants, who, perhaps, are not one half of the whole? What does the quota of any single communicant amount to? Besides that, in reality, we give God nothing: we take all to ourselves, though not all of it provided at our own proper cost or charge. Was there ever such a sacrifice known or thought on, either among Jews or Gentiles, since the world stood? Or were the primitive Christians ever charged with anything of this kind?

II. It is pretended further, that this material oblation is of 'greater value than ourselves[g].' Impossible, if we ourselves are the offerers[h]: for it is a clear and uncontestable maxim, (as I

[d] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 62.

[e] Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 10.

[f] 2 Sam. xxiv. 24.

[g] Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 107.

[h] That we are the offerers (and not Christ, as the Romanists absurdly pretend) is allowed by Dr. Hickes, who says, 'As the congregation offered, so it consecrated and performed the whole eucharistical service, by the ministration of the priest; who therefore always administered in the plural number . . . προσφέρομέν σοι, we offer,' &c. Christian Priesth. vol. i. pref. Account, pp. 22, 23.

The Romanists themselves allowed it, a few years before the Council of Trent; as appears from Alphonsus a Castro. Haeres. lib. x. fol. 214. ed. A.D. 1549.

'Sacerdos, in persona Ecclesiae, praesentat Deo Patri oblationem factam per Filium in ara crucis.' Cp. Field, p. 210, and Spalatensis, lib. v. c. 6. p. 282.

have hinted above,) that the value of a sacrifice can never rise higher than the value of the sacrificers. Upon the strength of which maxim our very learned and judicious Dean Field did not scruple to intimate, that if a man could be supposed to sacrifice even Christ our Lord, it would not be so valuable as the sacrifice of himself[i]. The same principle is confirmed by the united voices of the ancients, who always looked upon self-sacrifice as the most valuable of any[k]. They had good reason to think so, if either our Lord's example, or St. Paul's authority[l], or the nature of the thing itself can be of any weight.

III. It is pretended, that the bread and wine are the most excellent and valuable sacrifice, because 'they are in mystery and inward power, though not in substance, the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the most sublime and divine sacrifice that men or angels can offer[m]:' they are enriched, replenished, overshadowed by the Holy Spirit, and by such Divine influence rendered the body and blood in efficacy and virtue, receiving by the Spirit a life-giving power[n].

To which I answer, 1. That it is certainly a valuable Sacrament: and what the author here enumerates may shew the value of what God gives to us, not the value of what we give to him in it. The Spirit, which is supposed to make all the value, is what God gives to us in the Eucharist, not what we give to God: for it cannot be supposed that we sacrifice the Holy Spirit. So that all that the author has here said, however pertinent to the sacra-

[i] Field on the Church, p. 209.

[k] Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. pp. 836, 848, 849, 860. Origen, tom. ii. p. 364. ed. Bened. Cyprian, Ep. 76. p. 232, alias Ep. 77. p. 159. Euseb. Demonst. p. 40. Basil, tom. iii. p. 207. ed. Bened. Nazianzen, tom. i. p. 38. Hilarius, p. 154. ed. Bened. Chrysost. tom. v. pp. 20, 231, 316, 503. tom. vii. p. 216. ed. Bened. Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xix. c. 23. lib. x. c. 20. ed. Bened. Procopius, in Isa. p. 22. Gregor. M. Dial. iv. c. 59.

[l] Rom. xii. 1. Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6.

[m] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 60: compare 67, 141.

[n] Johnson, ibid. p. 171. Note, That overshadowing is peculiar to Baptism: for because it is said, that a man must be born of water and of the Spirit, the Fathers sometimes followed the figure, in describing the new birth. The Spirit is quasi maritus; the water is marita, and foecundata, and therefore styled unda genitalis. The Holy Ghost overshadows; the water brings forth; and the holy thing born is the new Christian. How to adapt the same figure to the Eucharist, I see not; nor how to apply it to the purpose of sacrifice.

mental part of the Eucharist, is foreign to the sacrificial, and can add little to the value of it. It is but consecrated bread and wine still that we are supposed to sacrifice; unless we take in Christ's natural body to enrich the sacrifice, which would be Popery; or else the Divine Spirit, which is worse. 2. Besides, it is certain, that the baptismal waters are as much enriched, replenished, overshadowed by the Holy Spirit, and have the same (if not greater) life-giving power, and yet they are no sacrifice at all. 3. I have before hinted, that no sacrifice which we can offer can be more valuable than ourselves: and therefore all this pompous train of words must come to nothing. 4. The notion of the Spirit's coming upon the elements, to make them absolutely the body, is a gross notion; arising only from a popular form of speech [o], and not consistent with the true and ancient doctrine, that the unworthy eat not the body nor drink the blood of Christ in the Eucharist [p]: neither have they the communion or fellowship of the Holy Spirit. It is not sufficient here to say, that they do receive the Spirit, but receive no benefit, because they resist or quench the Spirit: for being 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' in the very act, (1 Cor. xi. 27,) there is no room to suppose that in that very act they receive motions of grace: and if they receive none, there are none to be quenched. Or if, on the contrary, they were certain to receive the kindly motions of the Spirit in the very act, who should forbid the unworthy coming to receive motions of grace? This evasion therefore will not answer the purpose. The Spirit deserts ill men in their sinful acts: therefore the unworthy do not receive the Spirit, but the elements only: therefore again, they receive not the body; because without the Spirit, the elements, ex hypothesi, are not the body and blood, but bare elements, having a relative holiness, because before consecrated, and that is all. 5. If the bread and wine once consecrated were absolutely the body and blood, by means of the Spirit, there is no reason why the bap-

[o] See my Review, above, pp. 83, 164, 174, 254, 257, 263.

[p] Above, p. 140. 'Ostensum est Dominum recedere cum negatur, nec immerentibus ad salutem prodesse quod sumitur, quando gratia salutaris in cinerem, sanctitate fugiente, mutetur.' Cyprian. de Laps. p. 214. ed. Bened.

tismal waters should not be thought Christ's blood absolutely, by means of the same Spirit. It is certain, from the nature of the thing, and it is confirmed by the concurring verdict of antiquity[q], that we are as properly dipped in the blood of Christ in Baptism, as we eat the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. Therefore the baptismal water is as valuable as the eucharistical wine, and as fit to make a sacrifice of; and it is also commemorative of the death and passion: consequently the elements in either Sacrament, being blessed with like privileges, and having the like dignity, have all of them, in that view, the same title, and ought all of them to be sacrifices, as much as any.

IV. It is further pretended, that the consecrated bread and wine are changed, if not in their substance, yet in their inward qualities[r]: which appears to be sound only, without meaning; or words without ideas. When water is said to have been miraculously changed into wine, the words carry some idea of an internal change of qualities: but when wine remains wine still, not changed as to colour, or taste, or smell, or any other perceivable quality, it is hard to say what that inward change means, or what idea it carries with it. Outward relations, adventitious uses or offices, are easily understood; and relative holiness carries some sense in it[s]: but the inward change, the inhering, intrinsic holiness, supposed in this case, will not comport either with true philosophy or sound theology. Whatever it means, or whatever it is conceived to be, certain it is, that it belongs as much to the consecrated waters of Baptism[t] as to the consecrated elements of the Eucharist: and so let it pass.

V. The most important paradox of all, relating to this head, is, that the consecrated elements are the substitutes of the body and blood; are sacrificed first, and afterwards taken by the communicants in lieu of the natural body and blood, or of the

[q] See my Review, above, p. 271. and to the references in the margin add, Salmasius contr. Grot. pp. 186, 191, 394. and Patrick's Full View of the Eucharist, p. 82.

[r] Grabe, Defens. Eccl. pp. 75, 87, 20, 85, 91. Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 254, 255, alias pp. 258, 259, 163, 181, 183, 244. first ed.

[s] See my Review, abovè, p. 80.

[t] Above, pp. 269, 270.

sacrifice of the cross[u]. 'The eucharistical bread and wine are made the most perfect and consummate representatives of the body and blood... They are not only substituted, but they are, by the power of the Spirit which is communicated to them, ... made the lively, efficacious Sacrament of his body and blood.... The visible material substitutes ... are the bread and wine: and when the Holy Spirit, which is his invisible representative, communicates its power and presence to the symbols, which are his visible representatives, they do thereby become as full and authentic substitutes, as it is possible for them to be[x]. The sacramental body and blood of Christ are substituted instead of the natural, and are therefore first to be presented to the most worthy party in the covenant, the infinite grantor of all mercies, and then, in the next place, to the least worthy persons, or the grantees, the whole body of Christian people[y].' How to make any clear sense or consistency of these or the like positions, I know not; but they seem to be embarrassed with insuperable perplexities. 1. The notion of substitute, as here applied, appears unaccountable. The sacramental body is supposed to be substituted for the natural, so as to be exclusively an equivalent for it, made such consummate proxy, substitute, representative, by the power and presence of the Holy Spirit with it and in it. This is the notion, if I can understand it. And if this be the notion, it is very different from the old notion of instruments of investiture, or deeds of conveyance, supposed to convey instrumentally some other thing[z], but not to be so given in lieu of it, as to exclude it, or supersede it, or to supply the want of it[a]. The rights, privileges, honours,

[u] Johnson, Propit. Oblat. pp. 29, 30, 44, 76.

[x] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 183, alias p. 186. Compare p. 344, alias 349, and p. 176, alias 179.

[y] Ibid. Pref. to second edit.

[z] See my Review, above, pp. 131, 132.

[a] For were it so, then the inward part, or thing signified, would not be our Lord's body, but a fictitious body given in its room: and if made such body absolutely, by an union with the Spirit, it would be more properly the body of the Spirit, than our Lord's body, from which it is supposed distinct: and in this way, the very idea of our mystical union with Christ's glorified body would be obscured or lost, and we should be but as aliens from his proper body; unless two bodies of Christ (not sign and thing, but absolutely two bodies, for the sacramental is said to be absolutely the body) were given at once in the Eucharist.

offices, so conveyed, are supposed to go with the pledges, and not to be made up to the grantee by an equivalent. The pledges (a ring, suppose, or book, or parchment, or staff) are worthless things in themselves, and are valuable only for what accompanies them, not for what they really inclose or contain. In a word, such pledges are not exclusively given in lieu of the things which they are pledges of, (for then the party would be no richer for them than the bare pledges amount to,) but such a manner of delivery is made in lieu of another manner; and the pledge and thing go together[b]. In the Eucharist, for example, Christ's crucified body and blood shed (that is, his atonement and sacrifice) are spiritually eaten and drank, under the pledges of corporal refreshment: and even the glorified body is received into real, but mystical union, under the same symbols. Those symbols, with what they contain, are not substitutes, in the sense of equivalents for the things, to supersede them; but they are instruments to convey them, and to bring them in effect to us. 2. It is not easy to explain how the supposed substitutes can be any sacrifice at all to God. The elements are not conceived substitutes of the body and blood, any otherwise than by the power and presence of the Spirit. The elements, with the Spirit, (not separate from the Spirit, which alone renders them so valuable,) are supposed the substitutes. Is the Spirit then sacrificed along with the elements? That is absurd. But if the Spirit makes no part of the thing sacrificed, the value departs from it, yea, and

[b] See my Review, above, pp. 131, 132. N.B. A thing may be said to be given in lieu, or instead of another thing, two ways: 1. In a sense exclusive; as when a stone, suppose, is given instead of bread, or a serpent instead of fish: where neither the fish nor the bread are supposed to be given, nor anything equivalent. To the same exclusive sense belongs the giving value for kind; as money, suppose, instead of house or land: where again neither the house nor the land is supposed to be given, but an equivalent in money. 2. But one thing is also said to be given in lieu of another thing, in an inclusive or accumulative sense; as when deeds are delivered instead of an estate, which is given with them and by them. Here, in strictness, the deeds are not substitutes or equivalents for the estate: but one form of delivery, which is practicable and easy, is substituted and accepted, instead of another form, which the principal thing given is not capable of. In this latter inclusive sense, the symbols of the Eucharist may be called substitutes, but not in the former.

the essence of the substitutes; for the body and blood, that is, the substitutes, are not sacrificed, but the elements only. If it be said, that grace or virtue accompanies the elements, in the presenting them to God, like as in the presenting the same elements to man; this again is perfectly unintelligible. We can understand that pardon and sanctification are presented to the communicants along with the symbols: but how pardon and sanctification should be presented, in the way of sacrifice, to God, is not easy to explain. 3. I must here also observe, that whatever those substitutes mean, the baptismal waters have as clear a claim, in that case, as the eucharistical elements can have: they are as certainly substituted in the sense of pledges, and in a sacramental way, as the other can be supposed to be. But it never was the intention of either Sacrament, that we should, in a sacrificial way, present to God as much or the same that God gives to us [c]. I see not the sense or the modesty of pretending to it. Spirit, pardon, grace, we may be glad to receive; but we have no right, no pretence, no power to offer the same in sacrifice. It is neither practicable nor conceivable; it is mere confusion: which confusion arises, partly, from the want of distinguishing between what is in the elements, from what comes with them; and partly, from the not distinguishing between the sacramental view of the Eucharist and the sacrificial; or between the gifts of God to man, and the gifts of man to God. The elements are in effect the body to us, because God gives us the body by and with the elements: but they are not in effect the body to God; because we do not give to God the fruits of the body crucified, or the privileges of the body glorified. A man must have very confused sentiments, who can argue from what we receive, in this case, to what we give as a sacrifice.

[c] Some such confuse notion appears more than once in the Propitiatory Oblation, pp. 27, 43. Comp. Preface to second edit. of Unbloody Sacrifice, and Advertisement, p. 498. Brevint takes notice of the like confusion in the conception of some Romanists upon this article. Depth and Myst. p. 20.

CHAP. III.

Pointing out some EXCESSES *in relation to our Lord's supposed Sacrifice in the Eucharist.*

I. IT is pretended, that our blessed Lord offered up his sacramental body, that is, the consecrated elements, as a material sacrifice in the Eucharist [d]. Now, in the first place, I find no Scripture proof of this position. The Romanists, in support of the general point of a material or sensible sacrifice, have often taken their tour from Melchizedek in Genesis down to Hebrews xiii. 10. And they have as often been pursued, in like order, by the best-learned Protestants [e], and forced out of all their intrenchments.

The plea from 'hoc facite,' when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist: I mean the excellent Picherell [f], who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also [g] have often confuted it; and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up. The other boasted plea, drawn from the use of the present tense, in the words of the institution, has been so often refuted and exposed [h], that I cannot think it needful to call that matter over again, in an age of so much light and learning. The fairest pretences from antiquity have likewise been again and again fully answered, mostly by the same hands. Wherefore, let that be my apology for not taking distinct notice of every particular advanced by the late learned Mr. Johnson; who has but little of moment, which had not been completely obviated on one side (as it had been

[d] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 85, 90, 92, edit. 2nd, part ii. pp. 1, 3, 6, 7, 178, 246, 242, et passim.

[e] Chemnitius, Rainoldes, Bilson, Hospinian, Duplessis, Mason, Spalatensis, Montague, Morton, Albertinus, Joan. Forbesius, Brevint, Towerson, Kidder, Payne.

[f] Picherellus, pp. 63, 136.

[g] Joan. Forbesius, p. 616. Mornaeus, p. 212. Salmasius contr. Grot. p. 444. Albertinus, pp. 498, 509. Morton, b. vi. ch. 1. p. 390. Towerson, p. 276. Brevint, Depth and Myst. p. 128. Payne, p. 9, &c. Pfaffius, pp. 186, 220, 259, 269.

[h] Picherellus, pp. 62, 138. Spalatensis, p. 278. Mason, p. 614. Morton, b. vi. ch. 1. p. 394. Albertinus, pp. 74, 76, 78, 119. Joan. Forbesius, p. 617. Brevint, p. 128. Kidder and Payne. Pfaffius, pp. 232, 233.

anticipated on the other side) long before he wrote in this cause. He was indeed a stranger to what had been done; because he had resolved and determined from the first so to be, and held to his resolution all along; as he frankly declared in 1714, and again in 1724[i]. I commend not his rule nor his conduct in that particular. Wise men will be always glad to see what wise men have said before them, in any point of controversy, and will not think themselves so perfectly secure against mistaking the sense either of Scripture or Fathers, as to need no counsellors to assist them, nor any eyes but their own[k]. It was not right to imagine, that in 200 years time, or nearly, (in a question very frequently canvassed by the best-learned men,) nothing had been thought on, nothing done, towards clearing the point; more than what a single writer might do at once, with a Bible only and some Fathers before him. I should not wonder if the strongest genius, walking by such a rule, should commit abundance of mistakes in the management of a controversy of any considerable compass or delicacy, such as this is. But I pass on.

It is certainly of some moment, that so learned and judicious a man as Picherellus (critically skilled in Scripture and Fathers, and under no bias, except it were to the Romish Church, in which he lived and died,) should so expressly and fully declare against our Lord's offering any expiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist[l]. It is also of some moment, that the current opinion before the Council of Trent was against the first Eucharist's being an expiatory sacrifice; and that the divines of Trent were almost equally divided upon that question; and that it was chiefly fear

[i] 'It was my resolution from the beginning, to take my measures and information from antiquity only, and therefore not to look into any of those books that had been written, either by those of the Church of Rome for their corrupted sacrifice, or by the Protestants against it: and I can truly say, I have most firmly and religiously observed this rule, which I at first proposed to myself.' Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, pref. epist. p. 39, first and second edit.

[k] Of the use and necessity of consulting moderns, (as well as ancients,) see Review, above, pp. 6–8. To neglect moderns, in such cases, is really nothing else but preferring one modern to all the rest, and claiming to be heard as an interpreter of Scripture and Fathers, at the same time refusing the favour of an hearing to every interpreter besides.

[l] Picherell, p. 134.

of the consequences, obvious to Protestants, which obliged the Council to controvert the then current persuasion [m]. It is not without its weight, that Jansenius, Bishop of Ghent, who died fourteen years after, was content to take in spiritual sacrifice, in order to make out some sacrifice in the first Eucharist [n]: as to which he judged very right; for undoubtedly our Lord so sacrificed in the Eucharist, and we do it now. But no proof has been given, nor ever can be given, of our Lord's sacrificing the elements. He might, yea, and did offer the elements for consecration, (which is very different from sacrificing, being done also in Baptism,) or he might present them as signs and figures of a real sacrifice, being also signs and figures of real body and blood: but as they were not the real body and blood which they represented, so neither were they the real sacrifice: neither can it be made appear that they were any sacrifice at all.

As the point now in question has not been proved, there is the less occasion to disprove it. Want of proof is sufficient reason for rejecting a position, according to the old rule, that the proof lies upon him that affirms. However, I may, 'ex abundanti,' throw in one reason against it, which may be as good as a thousand, because it is decisive. If the elements were a sacrifice in the first Eucharist, as upon the principles lately advanced, then they were given for remission of sins; consequently were a sin offering and an expiatory sacrifice: which is directly repugnant to the whole tenor of the New Testament, everywhere ascribing true expiation solely to the death of Christ. It is in vain to plead, that this other sacrifice expiated in virtue of what it represented. The blood of bulls and of

[m] See Jurieu, Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 380.

[n] 'Dicendum est, quod, Christum in Coena et Eucharistiae institutione sacrificium obtulisse, primum quidem satis est significatum, cum dicitur gratias egisse. Gratiarum actio enim est quoddam sacrificium: a qua Christi actione Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini habuit nomen illud ab initio Ecclesiae, ut diceretur Eucharistia. Igitur cum gratiarum actio est sacrificium, et Sacramentum hoc dicatur et sit Eucharistia, (quod est gratiarum actio,) consequitur ex Christi actione, et nomine a Christi actione imposito, Sacramentum hoc esse sacrificium. Unde in canone dicitur sacrificium laudis: de quo Psalmista, immola sacrificium laudis,' &c. Jansenius, Comm. in Concord. Evang. p. 904.

goats represented Christ's sacrifice, and expiated, so far as they did expiate, in virtue of it: yet St. Paul plainly teaches, that it was not possible, in the very nature of the thing, for those secondary sacrifices to 'take away sins [o],' that is, to make true and spiritual expiation. They might atone (and that in virtue of the grand atonement) for legal offences, or typical sins, and might sanctify to the 'purifying of the flesh [p],' procuring some temporal blessings, which were figures and shadows of eternal: but more than that they could not do. True expiation always rested immediately and solely in the prime sacrifice. And the secondary sacrifices could avail no further, by any virtue whatever, than to secondary, that is, typical and temporal expiation. Now, as we have no typical expiation at all under the Gospel, nor look for any remission but what is spiritual, and 'pertaining to the conscience [q];' it is exceeding plain, that the remission of the Eucharist resolves immediately and entirely into the prime and grand sacrifice, and not into any supposed elemental sin offering. Neither indeed is there any such thing under the Gospel; it being one of the great Gospel privileges to have immediate access to the true expiation, and not to be kept, as it were, at a distance from it, by the intervention of secondary sacrifices, or secondary expiations [r].

Such most certainly is the doctrine of Scripture and of all antiquity: and our own excellent Liturgy was altogether formed upon it. Accordingly we never ask remission on account of any expiatory sacrifice but Christ's alone; never conclude our prayers (no, not even in the Communion service) through the sin offering of the Eucharist, but through Jesus Christ our Lord: that is, through his merits, solely and immediately, and his sacrifice, not through any sacrifice of our own: which would be both superstitious and profane.

If the reader would see the sense of the ancients, with respect to the words of institution, 'body given and blood shed for remission of sins,' he may turn to Albertinus [s], who produces

[o] Heb. x. 4.
[p] Heb. ix. 13.
[q] Heb. ix. 9.
[r] See above, pp. 443, 444.
[s] Albertinus, p. 78. Compare 74, 119. And Bishop Morton, b. i. part 3. p. 112; b. vi. ch. i. p. 394, &c.; ch. viii. p. 475, &c.

a long list of ancients [t], (besides a multitude of moderns, Schoolmen and Romanists [u],) all interpreting the words, not of the sacramental body and blood given in the Eucharist, but of the real body and blood which were to be given upon the cross. I may add one more, older than any of them, namely, Tertullian; who does not only so interpret the words, but occasionally mentions it as a very great absurdity, to interpret the 'body given for you,' of the 'bread given:' inasmuch as it would amount to saying, that the bread was to be crucified for us [x]. These things considered, we may take leave to conclude, that the notion of Christ's offering the consecrated elements as a sacrifice, may justly be numbered among the unwarrantable excesses of some few moderns, who did not well consider what they were doing.

II. It is pretended further, that such sacrifice of the consecrated elements, or sacramental body and blood, was our Lord's most solemn act of his Melchizedekian priesthood. Indeed, to make out this Melchizedekian offering, sometimes our Lord's sacrificing himself along with the symbols is taken in [y]: but I wave the consideration of that additional part at present, designing to treat of it separately in the next article. The sacrifice of the consecrated symbols by itself, must, upon the foot of the new scheme, be reckoned Melchizedekian; as well because our eucharistical sacrifice (which is not of the natural body, but of the sacramental only) is reputed Melchizedekian [z], as also because it is self-evident, that Melchizedek did not

[t] Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerome, Pelagius, Theodorit, Fulgentius, Ferrandus, Primasius, Pseud-Ambrose, Hesychius, Remigius, Sedulius, Bede, Isidorus, Claudius Taurinensis, Haymo, Euthymius, Theophylactus, Anselm.

[u] Aquinas, Hugo Cardinalis, Carthusianus, Titelmannus, Valentia, Salmeron, Sà, Jansenius, Cajetan, Vasquez, Maldonate, Barradas, Suarez, &c.

[x] 'Si propterea panem corpus sibi finxit quia corporis carebat veritate; ergo panem debuit tradere pro nobis: faciebat ad vanitatem Marcionis, ut panis crucifigeretur.' Tertull. contr. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 40. p. 571.

[y] 'The Spirit by which they wrote directed them . . . to represent our Saviour, as now performing the most solemn act of his Melchizedekian priesthood, and therefore as offering his body and blood to God, under the symbols of bread and wine.' Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 83, alias 86.

[z] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 317, alias 322.

sacrifice the natural body of Christ, which was not then in being, but the sacramental only, if either. If therefore our Lord's sacrifice of himself in the first Eucharist be taken in to complete the most solemn act, then it must be said, that he offered two sacrifices in the Eucharist, and both of them Melchizedekian; of which I shall say more below, in the place proper for it. Our present concern is only with the sacrifice of the consecrated elements, considered as a Melchizedekian sacrifice by itself.

I apprehend that it has not, and that it cannot be proved, that Melchizedek (so far as his priesthood, or the acts of it are recorded in Scripture) made any expiatory, or any material sacrifice at all. His sacerdotal function was described but in part, to make it the fitter type of part of our Lord's priesthood. Other parts of our Lord's priesthood were sufficiently typified by the Aaronical priesthood: but some further type was still wanting, to typify what Aaron's priesthood could not do. Aaron's typified the transient part, the atoning part; which was to be performed once for all by our Lord: but the abiding or everlasting part (viz. the distributing the subsequent or permanent benefits of that atonement) was not provided for in Aaron's priesthood, considered as typical of our Lord's, but was to be typified another way; namely, by the priesthood of Melchizedek, represented no further in Scripture than the reason of such type required. Melchizedek therefore was introduced, not as offering any sacrifice of atonement, (that was to be considered as previously executed,) but as conveying or applying, instrumentally, the subsequent blessings of that atonement. This was part of the sacerdotal office: and in respect of this part only, Melchizedek was introduced as a priest; to typify, as I said, the permanent part of our Lord's priesthood. Types, at the best, are but imperfect resemblances of their antitypes or archetypes: and therefore it is no wonder, if our Lord's priesthood (a complicated office) could not sufficiently be represented, whole and entire, by any single type, but might require several, and of different kinds, to represent it distinctly, as branched out into its several distinct particulars.

Whoever well considers in what manner Melchizedek is in-

troduced in Genesis [a], and what is further said of him by the Psalmist [b] and by St. Paul [c], will easily perceive the truth of what I say. Melchizedek, therefore, so far as he is brought in for a type, did not sacrifice at all, (except it were in the spiritual way of lauds,) but he instrumentally conveyed to Abraham the blessings of the grand sacrifice; like as Christian ministers now do to the children of Abraham, that is, to all the faithful.

The ancient Fathers, who have often been wrongfully appealed to in this matter, by Papists in general, and by some Protestants, meant no more than what I have here said: though it would be tedious to enter into a detail of them [d]. They meant, that Melchizedek, by a divine instinct [e], foreseeing the sacrifice of the cross, offered to God, by way of thanksgiving, a mental, vocal, manual representation or figuration of it, by the symbols of bread and wine; and by the same symbols, instrumentally conveyed to Abraham the spiritual blessings of it. This I observe of those Fathers who make the most of what Melchizedek did: but the Fathers of the first two centuries and a half say nothing expressly of his offering to God anything, (whether in a spiritual way or otherwise,) but only of his feasting Abraham and his family. As to the later Fathers, some of them speak with the same reserve as the more ancient Fathers did; others are more explicit: but none of them, I conceive, went further than what I have mentioned. Upon the whole therefore, their testimonies are altogether foreign to the point of sacrificing the elements, being that they were not considered as sacrifices, but as figures of a sacrifice, and instruments of a thanksgiving service.

What Mr. Johnson has pleaded in favour of his notion had been sufficiently obviated by Picherell [f], among the Romanists,

[a] Gen. xiv. 18.

[b] Psalm cx. 4.

[c] Heb. v. 6, 10, 11; vi. 20; vii. 1–24.

[d] The ancients referred to on this article are, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Julius Firmicus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Ambrosius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Pelagius, Austin, Isidorus Pelusiota, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodorit, Leo Magnus, Arnobius junior, Caesarius of Arles, Cassiodorus, Primasius, Isidorus Hispalensis, Damascene, Pseud-Athanasius, Pseudo-Cyprianus, Pseud-Ambrosius, Paschasius Radbertus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Euthymius, Potho Prumiensis; and perhaps more.

[e] Vid. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 243.

[f] Picherell, pp. 116, 135, 333, &c.

long before; and by many judicious Protestants[g] after him. The same has been confuted by the learned Pfaffius[h] since; as also by the reverend and learned Mr. Lewis, in a small tract[i], containing much in a little; close, clear, and judicious, published in 1714.

The sum then is, that if our Lord's performances in the first Eucharist were such as Melchizedek performed, (by the accounts which Scripture and antiquity give of them,) they amounted only to a spiritual sacrifice of lauds, a representation of the sacrifice to be made upon the cross, and a distribution of the benefits and blessings of that sacrifice to his disciples.

III. It is pretended, that our Lord did not only sacrifice his sacramental body in the Eucharist, but his natural body besides, sacrificed both in the same act[k]. This refinement of the material scheme was not thought on (so far as appears) before 1714, and then hardly submitted to, after much reluctance, by the learned Dr. Hickes; and not well relished by others on the material side, whom Mr. Johnson complained of in 1720[l]. However, the 'strength of the cause' was now made to 'depend in a great measure,' upon that 'matter of fact,' (as it is called[m],) advanced without proof, or so much as appearance of proof; excepting the precarious argument drawn from the present tense, mentioned above; and except another as slight an argument drawn from John xvii. 20, taken with some obscure testimonies of Fathers; which at most prove only that our Lord devoted himself in the Eucharist or elsewhere, before his passion, to be an expiatory sacrifice on the cross: not that he sacrificed himself, in the expiatory sense, before. A person's devoting himself in order to be such a sacrifice, is not performing the sacrifice, any more than

[g] Jewel, Answ. to Harding, p. 425. Peter Martyr, Loc. Comm. p. 895. Bilson, p. 702. Spalatensis, p. 272. Mason, p. 557. Gul. Forbesius, p. 672, second edit. Jackson, vol. ii. p. 955. vol. iii. p. 305, Morton, b. vi. Brevint, Depth and Myst. p. 107, &c. 135. Outram, p. 228. Kidder and Payne. Albertinus, pp. 199, 200.

[h] Pfaffius, pp. 196, 278, 321, 323.

[i] Lewis, Answ. to Unbloody Sacrifice, pp. 18–23.

[k] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 49, 83, 118, first edit. alias 51, 86, 122, second edit. part ii. pp. 6–10.

[l] Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. p. 56.

[m] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 272.

engaging to do a thing is actually doing it[n]. So slender are the proofs of this new notion. But let us see what self-contradictions and other absurdities it contains in it, or carries with it.

1. It is supposed to be the most solemn act of the Melchizedekian priesthood; though it is certain that Melchizedek neither so sacrificed himself, nor our Lord's natural body or blood, not then existing.

2. It supposes two expiatory sacrifices made by our Lord in the Eucharist; one of the sacramental body, and the other of the real: this the author seems to own, thinking he has some colour for it in Hebrews ix. 23, where St. Paul (he says) calls the offering made by Christ sacrifices, in the plural number[o]. As to the construction of that text, I am content to refer to commentators, not suspecting that so forced and strange a sense is at all likely to gain many followers: the hypothesis itself must be better supported, before any such odd meaning of that text can be admitted. But what shall we do with those two sacrifices of our Lord's in the Eucharist? They agree not with the words of institution, 'This is my body:' which should rather have run, This is my two bodies, my sacramental one, and my natural: and so likewise the words, 'This is my blood.' Then again, those two sacrifices, being both expiatory, both given for the 'life of the world,' there would be two propitiations, two expiations; and we shall want to know what was the precise value of this, and what of that, and whether they differed in value as finite and infinite; or whether they were of equal worth.

It is pleaded, that they were both but one oblation: which is resembled to a deed of gift, where, by delivery of a parchment, lands or houses are conveyed; and it is further likened to a man's presenting to God houses, &c., by a piece of money, or a

[n] Of this see Dr. Turner's Christian Eucharist no Proper Sacrifice, p. 19, &c. Field's words in the like case are very applicable here: 'This proveth not a real sacrifice of Christ. . . . For his blood is not poured out, neither is he slain indeed. As in the time of the old Law, if the priest reaching forth his hand to slay the beast that was brought to be sacrificed, had been so hindered by something interposing itself, that he could not slay the same, he had offered no sacrifice, but endeavoured only so to do, so is it here.' Field, p. 207.

Put 'engaged' for 'endeavoured,' and the argument is much the same.

[o] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pref. p. 5.

pair of gloves [p]. But this account will not tally, because the sacramental body is supposed to be a complete substitute [q], made so by the Holy Spirit; which therefore must be a great deal more than a pledge or earnest of the natural, being itself absolutely Christ's body, and invested with the like power and efficacy. So here were two sacrifices of like power and efficacy, and therefore of like value, as it seems: there were principal and proxy, the thing itself and the equivalent, both together, though they mutually superseded each other [r]. The first of them seems to be advanced, in order to make our Lord's two sacrifices look like one sacrifice; and the second, to the end that ours, which is but one of the two, and infinitely slighter, may yet look as considerable to us now, as both his then were to his disciples [s]. But if the elemental sacrifice be considered only as gloves or parchment in comparison, notwithstanding all its inherent virtues and enrichings of the Spirit, then it is not a substitute in the sense contended for, nor of any considerable value; so that instead of calling it a substitute or a sacrifice, we may better call it a sign or figure of our Lord's sacrifice, or at most a pledge, earnest, or token of our own. I here take it for granted, that our Lord's elemental sacrifice was at least as good as ours can be supposed to be: and if even his was but as gloves or parchment, (comparatively speaking,) ours, at this day, can be no more; and if so, it does not appear worth the contending for, while we have an infinitely better sacrifice to trust to, and to rest our expiation upon.

[p] Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. 57.

[q] See above, p. 454.

[r] Ibid.

[s] N.B. As there are two inconsistent accounts here tacked together, in order to serve two different purposes, so it is observable, that different reasons, in different places, have been assigned for calling the elements the body: for when they are to be made substitutes, then the reason given for the name of body is, that they are in power and effect, by the Spirit, the same with the archetypes, the very body and blood which they represent. Part i. pp. 177–212. But when it is to be proved, that Christ offered his natural body besides, then the reason why the elements are called his body is quite another reason, viz. because he offered his natural body a sacrifice by and under the elements, as symbols or pledges. See part ii. pref. p. 2. I may note, that if the last reason were a true one, we could have no pretence now for calling the elements his body; because it is not our intention to offer, under the symbols, our Lord's natural body as a sacrifice for the sins of men: we cannot sacrifice Christ our Lord.

3. There is no more proof made that our Lord in the Eucharist consigned his natural body to be broken, and his natural blood to be shed, than that he consigned the same to be then and there eaten and drank. It is allowed, that what was given for them in the Eucharist, was also given to them; and what was given to them, that they received [t]. If therefore our Lord then and there gave his natural body and blood for them, they then and there received the same natural body and blood: but if he gave them not, no transfer, no sacrifice was yet made of them. It is argued, 'if the bread and wine were' [in the Eucharist] 'given to God, so were Christ's natural body and blood too [u];' by the same way of reasoning, if the bread and wine were in the Eucharist given to the disciples, so were Christ's natural body and blood too.

I know it is denied that Christ gave his natural body, in such a sense, to the disciples, because of the glaring absurdity; and it is pleaded in that case, that our Saviour, in the institution, 'said not one word of his natural body [x].' But why then is it pretended, from the same institution, that he consigned his natural body to God as a sacrifice [y]? If our Lord's silence, as to his natural body, is an argument that it was not then given to the Disciples, the same silence is as good an argument to prove that it was not then given for them to God: or if any words of the institution prove that the natural body was then given for them, the same words will equally prove, that it was also then given to them and received by them; and orally too, according to the hypothesis which I am here examining. To be short, upon the principles advanced to support the material sacrifice, it most evidently follows, either that the natural body was not given to God in the first Eucharist; or if it was, that it was literally given to the disciples also, and orally received by them.

IV. Another paradox relating to this head is, 'that our Saviour laid down his life, when, by a free act of his will, he did

[t] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 87, alias 91. part ii. p. 11.

[u] Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. 57.

[x] See Brett's Discourse on the Eucharist, pref. p. 16. Answer to Plain Account, p. 41. Johnson, Propit. Oblat. p. 33.

[y] See Johnson, part i. pp. 64, 83. part ii. pp. 4, 6, 7, 9, 272, 273.

give his body and blood to God, in the Eucharist[z].' It might as justly and with as much propriety be said, that he was crucified at the table, or died at his last Supper. But the author, I presume, being sensible, that where our Lord 'laid down his life,' there he sacrificed himself, and having conceived that the sacrifice of himself should be performed in the Eucharist, and there only, he was under a kind of necessity of maintaining, (pursuant to his other principles,) that our Lord 'laid down his life' in the Eucharist. The love of Christ towards us is sometimes expressed by his 'laying down his life' for us[a]; and oftener by his 'dying[b]' for us: which (besides the general use of the phrase of 'laying down one's life') is a more special argument with respect to this case, that the phrases are here equivalent. Let it be said then, that Christ was crucified, slain, gave up the ghost, or resigned his spirit in the Eucharist: indeed, they may any of them be as reasonably asserted, as that he literally sacrificed himself in the Eucharist.

Another learned writer, on the same side, chooses rather to say, that our Lord 'laid down his life,' when he surrendered himself to the band of soldiers[c]; which was after his last Supper: but if any person would undertake to justify such new construction of the phrase, he should produce some example to shew, that any one has ever been said to have 'laid down his life' without dying, or before he died. And yet if any such example could be produced, it would not fully come up to this particular case, because our blessed Lord, at the very last moment, when he resigned his soul, had it in his power to rescue himself from death, as well as he had power to raise the dead. His life no man could wrest from him at any time: neither was it taken till the very instant when he 'laid it down of himself[d],' condescending to suspend his Divine power, or the exercise of it. But I shall have another occasion to say more of this matter under the following chapter.

[z] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 69.

[a] John x. 15, 17, 18. 1 John iii. 16.

[b] Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 9. 1 Cor. viii. 11; xv. 3. 2 Cor. v. 15. 1 Thess. v. 10.

[c] Brett's Answ. to Plain Account, pp. 62, 75.

[d] John x. 18.

CHAP. IV.

Pointing out some EXCESSES *in relation to the* SACRIFICE OF THE CROSS.

THE sacrifice of the cross is so momentous an article of the Christian religion, that we have great reason to be jealous of any attempt either to overturn it, or to undermine it. No such thing was ever formally attempted, that I know of, by any Divines of our Church, before 1718, when the second part of Unbloody Sacrifice appeared. The author himself, in his first part, had owned the sacrifice of the cross more than once [e], in words at least; though he then seems to have scrupled, in some measure, the use of the phrase, and to have been looking out for some evasive construction to put upon it. Afterwards, in some places, he ordered mactation to be read for sacrifice [f], or for oblation: and mactation at length became his usual expression for what we call the sacrifice of the cross. Let us examine his reasons or motives for this so important a change in Christian theology.

1. His first scruple seems to have been what he had hinted in the first edition of his first part, where he says, 'By sacrificed on the cross, we must then mean, that he was slain as an expiatory victim, and not that he offered himself as a Melchizedekian priest; for he declares that he did this in the Eucharist. For this, says he, is my body given to God for you [g].' He adds afterwards, 'It cannot be proved,' that the Melchizedek in Genesis did offer bloody sacrifice [h]. This pretence is very slight; because it cannot be proved, by anything said in Genesis, or any other part of Scripture, or by antiquity, universality, and consent, that Melchizedek sacrificed bread at all, or that he did

[e] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 12, 66, 68, 95, first edit. Propit. Oblat. p. 106.

N.B. Dr. Hickes all along owned the sacrifice of the cross. (Christ. Priesth. vol. i. p. 165.) So likewise Mr. Leslie, and Mr. Scandret, pp. 4, 8, 157. Dr. Brett also, as late as 1713, which appears by his Sermon on the Christian Altar, &c. pp. 18, 19. Though he adopted Mr. Johnson's new notions in or before 1720. Discourse, &c. p. 39.

[f] See Johnson, part ii. p. 267.

[g] Ibid. p. 95.

[h] Ibid. p. 472.

anything more (so far as he is brought in for a type) than what amounted to the prefiguration of the grand sacrifice, and an instrumental conveyance of the blessings of it[i]. However, as it is certain from Scripture, confirmed by antiquity, universality, and consent, that our Lord did offer himself a sacrifice on the cross, and that our Lord was not a priest of any other order but the order of Melchizedek, it most evidently follows, that such his sacrifice was so far Melchizedekian, was an act of that priesthood which was altogether Melchizedekian, and not Aaronical[k]. In the strictest sense, no material sacrifice, bloody or unbloody, no active sacrifice at all, (excepting the sacrifice of lauds,) can be Melchizedekian; for Melchizedek, as a type, offered nothing but lauds to God, and blessings to Abraham under visible signs: but as our Lord's priesthood was entirely Melchizedekian, and contained the atoning as well as benedictory part, it is manifest, that even the atonement, so considered, was Melchizedekian, as opposed to Aaronical. In short then, it must not be said that our Lord's sacrifice was bloody, and therefore not Melchizedekian; but it was Melchizedekian, though bloody[l], because it was our Lord's, who was of no other priestly order but the order of Melchizedek. It is a poor thought of the Romanists, and it is well exposed by Dean Brevint[m], that bread and wine are necessary to every act or exercise of the Melchizedekian priesthood: for as the notion is founded in error, so it terminates in absurdity. Our Lord had no bread to offer on the cross: neither has he any bread or wine to offer in heaven, where he intercedes as a priest in virtue of his sacrifice once offered, and blesses as a priest, and 'abideth a priest continually[n].' But I proceed.

2. The first and main scruple against the sacrifice of the cross being thus considered and confuted, there will be less difficulty

[i] See above, p. 463, &c.

[k] Heb. vii. 11, 13, 14, 16, 17.

[l] N.B. It cannot be reasonably doubted but that Melchizedek offered bloody sacrifices, after the way of the ancient Patriarchs: only, that part of his priesthood was not mentioned; as there was no need to mention it, since the benedictory part of his priesthood was all that the type intended was concerned in, as I before intimated.

[m] Brevint, Depth and Mystery, &c. pp. 116–118.

[n] Heb. vii. 3.

with the rest, which are slighter, and which appear to have been invented purely to wait upon the other. A second scruple is, that our Lord could not, while alive, offer (unless it were under symbols) his body and blood, as substantially separated; because it appears not that any blood flowed from him till the soldier pierced him; but it is probable, that the 'nails so filled the orifices,' that 'no blood could issue thence[o].' I shall venture to leave this ingenious speculation with the reader.

3. Against the sacrifice of the cross, it is pleaded, that to suppose it, 'is to render the sacrifice of Christ a bloody one indeed; so bloody, as that it cannot be reconciled to purity of any sort, till killing one's self be esteemed a virtue[p].' The same argument, as lately revived by another gentleman, runs thus: 'He could not offer himself a sacrifice in any other manner than by symbols or representatives: for had he in any manner put himself to death, he might have been too justly accused of self-murder[q].' Sorry I am, that anything of this kind, though only in the way of argument, should drop from serious and religious persons: and I was in some doubt with myself, whether I could prudently or reverently repeat it, though in order only to confute it. But who can any longer bear to have that most precious sacrifice, upon which all our hopes and all our comforts depend, treated in a manner far from becoming it? Why must Christ's laying down his life be so invidiously, so injuriously called putting himself to death? To resign his life, or voluntarily to submit to death, is one thing: to put himself to death is quite another, differing as active disobedience from passive obedience. But though he was passively obedient, in submitting to suffer, bleed, and die for us, it does not therefore follow, that he exercised no act of offering, or that he made no active sacrifice on the cross. It was his own choice to submit to the will

[o] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, pref. pp. 4, 5.

[p] Ibid. part ii. p. 70.

[q] Brett's Answ. to Plain Acc. p. 66. One might here make use of Tertullian's argument against Marcion, (cited above, p. 462,) with a very little change. 'If our Lord made for himself a body of bread, to be sacrificed, because he could not offer himself in any other manner than by symbols, then was bread given for the life of the world, and bread should have been crucified for us.'

of his enemies, and his choosing so to suffer, so to be passive, for the honour of God and the salvation of men, was the divinest act and exercise of true piety and philanthropy. It was active virtue, as all choice (whether to do or to suffer) is equally active, an act of the will, and a work[r]. He thus actively offered on the cross his body, his blood, his soul, his life to God; choosing not to kill, but to be killed; not to slay, but to be slain: and by such act of submission and resignation to the will of God, he made himself a voluntary sacrifice, in his death, for the sins of mankind. This is the plain doctrine of the Gospel, which every one that runs may read: and it is confirmed by as early, as universal, and as constant, a tradition for fifteen centuries or more, as any point of Christian doctrine whatsoever; from Barnabas, Clemens, and Ignatius[s], down even to Socinus of the sixteenth century. It would be tedious to enter into the detail of authorities; neither can it, I presume, be necessary. I shall only hint further, that from the third century and downwards, 'altar of the cross[t]' has been the current language: one certain argument, among many, that the sacrifice was supposed to be made upon the cross. And such also is the language of the Greek and Oriental liturgies[u].

It is very wrong to suggest that our Lord was merely passive in laying down his life, because nature was spent, and because he had been half dead before, and the like[x]; as if any violence of death could have wrested his soul from him, the Lord of life,

[r] Aquinas understood 'active' and 'passive' as well as most can pretend to: and he scrupled not to call our Lord's passive obedience, a work: 'Hoc ipsum opus, quod voluntarie passionem sustinuit,' &c. See above, p. 448. The argument from the word 'patient,' or 'passive,' in this case, is only playing upon an equivocal name, and committing a fallacy.

[s] Barnabas, Ep. ch. vii. p. 21. Coteler. Clem. Rom. Epist. i. c. 49. Ignatius ad Ephes. c. ii.

[t] Orig. tom. ii. p. 220. cp. 187, 83, 362. ed. Bened. Eusebius de Laud. Constant. 765. ed. Cant. Hieronym. tom. ii. part. 2. 167. tom. iii. 384. ed. Bened. Ambrosius, tom. i. 995, 1002. tom. ii. 1054. ed. Bened. Chrysostom, tom. ii. 403, 404. ed. Bened. in Heb. 839. Augustinus, tom. iv. 211, 1565. tom. v. Append. 273. tom. viii. 820. Leo Magn. tom. i. 251, 261, 264, 267, 276, 293. Quen. Venant. Fortunat. Hymn. de Pass. Christi, p. 695.

[u] Jacob. Liturg. p. 35. Fabric. Basil. Liturg. Copt. p. 24. Renaud. Gregorii Liturg. Copt. 36. 37. cp. 46. Basilii Liturg. Alex. p. 83. Gregorii Liturg. pp. 120, 121, 123. Ordo Commun. Syr. Jacob. p. 22.

[x] Johnson, part ii. pp. 69, 70.

as it may ours. Our older and better divinity may be seen in the learned and judicious Bishop Bilson, who confirmed the same both by Scripture and Fathers. It ran thus: 'The conjunction of the human nature with the Divine, in the person of Christ, was so fast and sure, that neither sin, death, nor hell, assaulting our Saviour, could make any separation, no not of his body: but he himself, of his own accord, must put off his earthly tabernacle, that dying for a season, he might conquer death for ever. And so the laying down his life was no imposed punishment, nor forcible invasion of death upon him, but a voluntary sacrifice for sin, rendered unto God for our sakes[y].' This doctrine Bishop Bilson defended against some rigid Calvinists of his time, who maintained the contrary[z] for the support of some other false principles. But I return.

The author of Unbloody Sacrifice, though he had argued before, several ways, against the sacrifice of the cross, yet retreated at length to this: 'I do not, nor ever did deny, that Christ offered himself on the cross; but I declare, I cannot prove it from Scripture; so that if it be true, I leave it to be proved by tradition[a].' How hard of belief in this high article, when it is undeniable that Scripture (taken in the sense of the Fathers of the first, second, and following centuries) does prove it; and when, in other cases, he conceived, that 'that man ought to suspect his own judgment and orthodoxy, whose opinions sink below the standard of the second age after Christ[b].' But we need not Fathers in this point, nor indeed anything but Scripture texts, and unprejudiced reason.

The prophet Isaiah represents our Lord as 'wounded for our transgressions,' and 'bruised for our iniquities,' and 'making his soul an offering for sin[c].' Where but on the cross? Not at his last Supper, where he was neither wounded nor bruised, except it were in effigy, nor offered his soul, so much as in effigy, whether we interpret it of soul or of life. His 'pouring out his

[y] Bishop Bilson, Full Redemption, &c. p. 8.
[z] Ibid. p. 229.
[a] Johnson, Saxon Laws, vol. i. pref. p. 58.
[b] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 212, alias 215.
[c] Isa. liii. 5, 10.

soul unto death,' (not his pouring out wine, or pouring out promises or engagements,) is by the same prophet made the one thing considerable [d].

Where our Lord 'bare our sins,' (a sacrificial phrase,) there most certainly he made his sacrifice: now St. Peter expressly tells us, that 'he bare our sins in his own body on the tree [e];' not in his sacramental body, or at the Communion table. Besides that it is manifest from the same text, that he had not made the expiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist: for if he had, he could have had none of our sins to bear in his body on the cross; neither indeed would his death have been necessary to our redemption, being superseded by the eucharistical remission, and by the atonement then made.

Where peace was purchased, where redemption and reconciliation were perfected, there may we look for the sacrifice of peace, redemption, and reconcilement. Now St. Paul says plainly, that he 'made peace through the blood of his cross,' (not through the blood of his holy table, whether sacramental or natural,) 'to reconcile all things [f],' &c. Again, 'we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son [g],' and reconciled 'unto God by the cross [h]:' not by the Eucharist of his Son, not by the Communion table. We were 'redeemed by his blood [i];' and 'made nigh by the blood of Christ [k],' and 'sanctified also by his blood [l]:' not in the Eucharist, where no blood was shed, except it were in effigy; neither will such sacramental shedding answer St. Paul's meaning, where he says, that 'without shedding of blood there is no remission [m].' Again, it is said, Christ 'appeared to put away sin by the SACRIFICE of HIMSELF: and as it is appointed unto men ONCE TO DIE—so Christ was ONCE OFFERED to bear the sins of many [n],' &c. Where it is plain, that he was to put away sin by sacrificing himself, and that, by dying; as appears by the similitude immediately following; 'As it is appointed unto men once to die, so Christ was once offered,' viz. in his death: otherwise the parallel

[d] Isa. liii. 12.
[e] 1 Pet. ii. 24. Compare Isa. liii. 4, 6, 11, 12.
[f] Coloss. i. 20.
[g] Rom. v. 10.
[h] Eph. ii. 26.
[i] Revel. v. 9.
[k] Eph. ii. 13.
[l] Heb. xiii. 12, x. 29, ix. 12, 13, 14.
[m] Heb. ix. 22.
[n] Ibid. 27, 28.

will not answer. It is in vain to say, that the offering was previous to his bearing our sins: for the prophet Isaiah expounds his 'making his soul an offering for sin,' by his 'pouring out his soul unto death[o].' So that his being offered to bear, must mean, that he was offered on the cross, where he was to pour out his soul, that upon the same cross he might bear our sins, &c.

More might be added, but I forbear to proceed further in so plain a point, so firmly grounded on Scripture, and so fully established by antiquity, universality, and consent; consent of the Christian churches from the beginning down to this day.

4. It was going great lengths, to say, 'I must humbly declare my opinion, that it is impossible to establish the doctrine of Christ's body and blood being a real sacrifice, by any other arguments but those by which we prove the Eucharist to have been instituted a sacrifice by our blessed Saviour[p].' Whatever might be the fate of this particular much disputed notion of the eucharistic sacrifice, one thing is certain, and will be readily allowed by every considerate man, that the general and unquestionable doctrine of the real sacrifice ought never to be put upon a level with it: neither ought it to have been so much as suggested, that there is any ground for so strange a comparison. It was obliging Socinians too far, to raise any doubt or question about the certainty of the sacrifice of the cross: but to throw out broad innuendoes besides, that it stands upon no better, or no other foundation, than the material sacrifice, the material and expiatory sacrifice of the Eucharist; what is it but betraying the Christian cause into the hands of the adversaries? For if they may reasonably urge, (or cannot reasonably be confuted, if they do urge,) that such material and expiatory sacrifice is a novelty of yesterday, scarce thought on before the dark ages of superstition, which made use of material incense for like purposes; scarce ever seriously maintained by any of the West before the sixteenth century, and then only by the Romanists; never admitted, in either part, by Protestants before the seventeenth century, nor then by many of them; never taught (as now

[o] Isa. liii. 10, 12.

[p] Johnson, Saxon Laws, pref. p. 54. Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pref. pp. 1, 2.

taught) before the eighteenth century, and then by a single writer only, for some time: I say, if the Socinians may reasonably urge the premises, the conclusion which they aim at is given them into their hands: and so at length this indiscreet zeal for an imaginary sacrifice of the Eucharist (not capable of support) can serve only to perplex, darken, or destroy, the real one of the cross [q].

I thought to go on to two chapters further, pointing out more excesses and inconsistencies of the new scheme. There is one which particularly deserved to be mentioned; the precarious consequence drawn from our Lord's supposed sacrifice in the first Eucharist to our sacrifice in the rest, built only upon this, that we are to do what Christ did [r]: an argument, which, if it proves anything, proves that we are to do all that Christ is supposed to have done by way of sacrifice; that is, to sacrifice his sacramental body and his natural also, (which is absurd,) or else to sacrifice ourselves under symbols, as our Lord sacrificed himself, which will not serve the purpose of the material scheme. One way the argument proves too much, and the other way too little; and so neither way will it answer the end designed. I am aware, that some will tell us what the argument shall prove, and what it shall not prove [s]. But who will

[q] The chief advocate for the new system says, 'It is no small satisfaction to me, that the sacrifice of the Eucharist, and the personal sacrifice of Christ, do rest upon the same foundation, and stand or fall together.' Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pref. pp. 1, 2. To which it is sufficient to say, God forbid! The personal sacrifice of Christ stands upon the rock of ages: the other (in his sense of it) is built upon the sand.

[r] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 50, 91, alias 51, 94. Johnson, part ii. p. 10.

[s] Johnson, part i. pp. 96, 122, alias 99, 126.

Dr. Brett on Liturgies, p. 135. N.B. The sum of what is pleaded on that side, when carefully examined, will be found to amount only to this: we are to do what Christ did, so far as serves the new system: but we are not to do what Christ did, so far as disserves it. 'Do this' shall be an argument, when and where it makes for it: 'do this' shall be no argument, when or where it makes against it. It is observable, that the words 'this do,' in the institution, come after the words 'take, eat, this is my body,' and therefore manifestly relate, not merely to the sacerdotal ministration, but to the whole action or actions both of priest and people. The blessing, the breaking, the pouring out, the distributing, the receiving, the eating, and the drinking, are all comprehended in the words 'this do.' All those actions are shewing forth the Lord's death, (1 Cor. xi. 26,) for a remembrance or memorial of him.

give a disputant leave to draw consequences arbitrarily, not regulated by the premises, but by an hypothesis, which itself wants to be regulated by reason and truth?

I have not here room to enter further into this matter: these papers are already drawn out into a length beyond what I at first suspected. I hope my readers will excuse my stopping short in this fourth chapter, and saving both myself and them the trouble (perhaps unnecessary trouble) of two more. It is of use in any controverted points, to observe what exit they are found to have, when pursued to the utmost. There were sufficient reasons before against a material sacrifice, considered in its best light, as purely gratulatory, or eucharistical: and there were more and stronger against the same considered as expiatory, or propitiatory; reasons, I mean, from Scripture and antiquity, and from the nature of things: but the managers for the material cause have now lately furnished us with a new argument against it, by shewing us, that, after all that can be done for it, it has really no exit, or such as is worse than none; while it terminates in various inconsistencies and incongruities; and not only so, but is contradictory also to sound doctrine, particularly to the momentous doctrine of the sacrifice of the cross.

A brief Analysis of Mr. Johnson's System, shewing what it is, and by what Steps he might be led into it.

1. The first thing in intention, last in execution, was to prove, that the Gospel ministers are proper priests.

2. Proper priests must have a proper sacrifice: therefore some medium was to be thought on, to prove a proper sacrifice, particularly in the Eucharist.

3. A prevailing notion, or vulgar prejudice, had spread among many, for a century or more, that no sacrifice could be proper, but a material one: therefore pains were to be taken to prove the Eucharist a material sacrifice.

4. But as material sacrifice carried no appearance of dignity in it, looking too low and mean for an evangelical priesthood to stand upon; therefore ways and means were to be used to raise some esteem of it: spiritual sacrifice was to be depreciated, and material to be magnified. Hence, as it seems, arose the thought of enriching the elements with the Spirit; borrowing from the sacramental part of the Eucharist, to augment and advance the sacrificial. And now the scheme appeared with a better face.

5. Nevertheless, if our Lord in the original Eucharist did not sacrifice the elements, it could not reasonably be supposed that we do it now, and so things would not tally: therefore it was found necessary to assert, that he also sacrificed the elements, as his sacramental body; and thereupon reasons and authorities were to be searched out for that purpose.

6. Still there was a weighty objection remaining, viz. that Scripture speaks often of Christ's offering himself, but never once of his offering in sacrifice the symbols: to remove which difficulty, it was thought best to say, that he offered himself in the Eucharist, but by and with the symbols. An afterthought, and not well comporting with former parts of the scheme.

7. But there was still another difficulty, a very great one; namely, that our Lord, according to the accounts of the New

Testament, sacrificed himself but once[t]: therefore, either he did it not in the Eucharist, or not upon the cross. To remove this difficulty, it seems to have been resolved to give up the sacrifice of the cross, and to retain only the sacrifice of the Eucharist: and so the scheme was complete.

Having thus given a sketch of the system in the analytical way, it may now be easy to throw it into the synthetic, thus:

1. Christ our Lord made a personal sacrifice of himself once; either in the Eucharist or on the cross.

2. It cannot be proved to have been on the cross, but there are divers reasons against the supposition; therefore it must have been in the Eucharist.

3. He sacrificed himself in the Eucharist, under symbols, sacrificing the symbols together with himself: otherwise we could have no pretence now for sacrificing the same symbols.

4. The Christian Church, after his example, sacrifices the symbols, but not him.

5. Therefore the Church has a material sacrifice.

6. Therefore the Church offers a proper sacrifice.

7. Therefore the Gospel ministers are proper priests, sacrificing priests: which was to be proved.

Now my humble opinion upon the whole is, that if the learned author had taken spiritual sacrifice for his medium, instead of material, he might not only have avoided many perplexities, and no small number of mistakes, but might also have come at his main point justly and regularly, in conformity with Scripture and antiquity. He might have proved that Christian ministers are priests in as high and as proper a sense as any before them have been, (Christ only excepted,) authorized to stand and minister between God and his people, and to bless in God's name, and to execute all other sacerdotal functions, but in a more spiritual and heavenly way than other priests had done: which detracts not at all from the propriety of the Christian priesthood, but adds very much to its value and excellency, and shews it to be of superior dignity to any real or pretended priesthood, either of Jews or Pagans.

[t] Propit. Oblat. p. 97.

A distinct summary View of the several OBLATIONS *in the Eucharist, previous to* CONSECRATION *or subsequent.*

What is previous, goes under the name of Ante-oblation: what is subsequent, falls under the name of Post-oblation.

I. Of the *Ante-oblation.*

THE ante-oblation has three parts, or three views, as here follows:

1. There is a presenting to God alms for the poor, and oblations for the use of the Church. The material things are gifts to men: the benevolent act, or work, is a gift, or sacrifice unto God. St. Paul points out this distinction where he teaches, 'To do good and to communicate' are 'such sacrifices' as 'God is well pleased with [u].' The benevolent services are the sacrifice; not the material money, or goods. This distinction is further confirmed by the common custom of speech; which shews what the common ideas are. Alms (that is, alms-deeds) make an atonement for sin: a true and a proper expression, understanding atonement in a qualified sense. But who would say, that money makes an atonement? By bounty and charity God is appeased: the proposition is true, and the expression proper. But can we say, that by silver and gold God is appeased? No, certainly. And why cannot we? Because it would be confounding ideas: for, even in common language, expressive of the common ideas, the service is the gift to God, not the material thing.

2. There is in the Eucharist a presenting to God (virtually at least) an acknowledgment of God's being Creator and Giver of all good things; as Irenaeus intimates [x]. Tertullian extends it to both Sacraments [y]: inasmuch as the religious use of water in

[u] Heb. xiii. 16. The like distinction is clearly laid down in Justin Martyr. Apol. ii. p. 60, ed. Paris, 1636. Τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διατροφὴν γενόμενα, οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾷν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν.

[x] Iren. lib. iv. cap. 18. p. 251.

[y] Tertull. contr. Marc. lib. i. cap. 14, 23.

Baptism carries in it a tacit acknowledgment that water is a creature of God.

3. There is also a presenting of the elements to God for consecration: which is common to both Sacraments. For in Baptism the waters are so presented, and for the same or like spiritual purposes.

II. Of the *Post-Oblation.*

The post-oblation, otherwise called commemoration, may likewise be considered under three views, or as containing three parts.

1. The first is, the offering to view, viz. of God, angels, and men, under certain symbols, the death, passion, or sacrifice of Christ. We do the like (not precisely the same) in Baptism also: for there we represent and commemorate mentally, vocally, and manually, (in mind, and by mouth, and by significant actions,) the death and burial of Christ our Lord.

2. The second is, the offering, as it were, to Divine consideration, with our praises and thanksgivings, Christ and his sacrifice, pleading the merit of it, in behalf of ourselves and others. We do something near akin to this in Baptism likewise, pleading the same sacrifice of atonement, with the merits thereof, in behalf of the persons baptized; offering the same to Divine consideration.

3. The third is, the offering up Christ's mystical body, the Church, or ourselves a part of it[z], as an holy, lively, reasonable

[z] Fulgentius's doctrine on this head is well worth the noting, as making the Church to be the sacrifice offered, and likewise as interpreting the illapse of the Spirit, conformably, of the Spirit's sanctifying that mystical body, viz. the Church. He flourished about 510, and is of greater antiquity and authority than most of the Greek, Latin, or Oriental liturgies now extant.

'Quum ergo sancti Spiritus ad sanctificandum totius Ecclesiae sacrificium postulatur adventus, nihil aliud postulari mihi videtur, nisi ut per gratiam salutarem in corpore Christi (quod est Ecclesia) caritatis unitas jugiter indisrupta servetur. . . Dum itaque Ecclesia Spiritum sanctum sibi caelitus postulat mitti, donum sibi caritatis et unanimitatis postulat a Deo conferri. Quando autem congruentius quam ad consecrandum sacrificium corporis Christi sancta Ecclesia (quae corpus est Christi) Spiritus sancti deposcat adventum? quae ipsum caput suum secundum carnem de Spiritu sancto noverit natum. . . . Hoc ergo factum

sacrifice unto God: a sacrifice represented by the outward signs, and conveyed, as it were, under the symbols of bread and wine.

This third article of the post-oblation is seen also in Baptism: for we are therein supposed to be dedicated, consecrated, devoted, through Christ, to God. On which account Baptism has been looked upon as a kind of sacrifice among the ancients [a].

Nevertheless, the Sacrament of the Eucharist has more particularly obtained the name of sacrifice: partly, on account of the offerings to church and poor in the ante-oblation, which are peculiar to that Sacrament; and partly, on account of the commemorated sacrifice in the post-oblation. For though Baptism commemorates the death and burial, and indirectly the grand sacrifice; yet it does not so precisely, formally, and directly represent or commemorate the sacrifice of the cross, as the Eucharist does.

est caritate divina, ut ex ipso Spiritu corpus illius capitis esset renatum, de quo ipsum caput est natum. . . . Haec itaque spiritalis aedificatio corporis Christi, quae fit in caritate, (cum scilicet secundum B. Petri sermonem, lapides vivi aedificantur in domum spiritalem, in sacerdotium sanctum, offerentes spiritales hostias, acceptabiles, Deo per Jesum Christum) nunquam opportunius petitur, quam quum ab ipso Christi corpore (quod est Ecclesia) in sacramento panis et calicis ipsum Christi corpus et sanguis offertur. Calix enim quem bibimus,' &c. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. Fulgent. ad Monim. lib. ii. pp. 34–37. ed. Paris. Cp. Fragment. p. 641.

[a] 'Cum venis ad gratiam Baptismi, vitulum obtulisti, quia in mortem Christi baptizaris.' Origen. in Levit. Hom. ii. p. 191. ed. Bened.

'Holocausto dominicae passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine baptizatus imbuitur.' Augustin. ad Rom. Expos. cap. xix. p. 937. ed. Bened.

'Ipse homo, Dei nomini consecratus, et Deo devotus, in quantum mundo moritur ut Deo vivat, sacrificium est.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242.

THE SACRAMENTAL PART OF THE EUCHARIST EXPLAINED, IN A CHARGE

DELIVERED IN PART TO

THE CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX

At the Easter Visitation, 1739.

Reverend Brethren,

In a former discourse[a], upon the like occasion, I endeavoured to explain the sacrificial part of the Eucharist more minutely than I had before done, for the removing of scruples and the obviating mistakes. I would now do something of like kind with respect to the sacramental part of the same, so far as it appears to be affected by the sacrificial; that so both parts may aptly suit with each other, and hang naturally together. As truth is uniform, so just notions of one part will of course tend to preserve just ideas of the other part also: and as error is apt to lead to error, so any erroneous tenets there, will naturally bring in erroneous positions here.

It is matter of fact, that for the sake of advancing a new kind of sacrifice, new doctrines have been offered, time after time, with regard even to the sacramental part of the Eucharist: which in truth is as much superior to the sacrificial, as God's part in that holy rite is superior to man's; and which therefore calls for our more especial caution and circumspection.

Great stress has, by some amongst us since 1702, been laid upon the invocation and illapse of the Holy Ghost upon the elements: not barely to make them sacred signs and pledges, or exhibitive symbols of Christ's body and blood to every faithful communicant, (which might reasonably be admitted,) but even to make them the very body, or verily the body of Christ: not the natural body, but another true body, called a spiritual body, consisting, as is presumed, of elements changed in their inward qualities, and replenished either with the Holy Spirit himself, or with the graces, or virtues, or energies of

[a] The Christian Sacrifice explained, in the preceding Charge.

the Spirit [b]; supposed to be intrinsic to them, inherent in them, permanent with them, and received both by worthy and unworthy communicants. It is said, that the 'Holy Spirit being invited and called down by the prayer of the priest, (according to the ancients,) descended upon the bread and wine on the altar, and enriched them with all the virtues and graces with which the personal body and blood of Christ did abound, and so made them in this, and perhaps in a yet more mysterious and incomprehensible manner, to be verily the body and blood of Christ; as the Holy Ghost did formerly come upon the blessed Virgin, and formed in her womb the personal body and blood of Christ [c]. That the consecrated symbols are sanctified, and altered, if not in their substance, yet in their internal qualities,—and that the eucharistical symbols themselves are verily made, in a mysterious manner, the body and blood of our crucified Saviour [d]. That this sacramental flesh and blood of Christ is taken by a corporeal eating and drinking of the unworthy, as well as worthy, communicants: of these, namely, to their justification and eternal salvation both of flesh and

[b] 'Spiritu Sancto, qui, ad invocationem sacerdotis descendens, panem sanctificat, et omni divina ac vivifica virtute corporis et sanguinis Christi eundem replet. . . . Ita ut Eucharistia duabus constet rebus, terrena, quae est materia panis, et caelesti, quae est gratia ac virtus Spiritus Sancti pani indita. . . . Divina illius virtus et gratia pani communicata ac inhaerens, uti jam paucis probabo.' Grabe. Ad Iren. lib. iv. cap. 34. pp. 327, 328.

In the same year, Dr. Allix, who saw deeper, condemned those notions, in very plain terms, while speaking of the modern Greeks, whose tenets those are.

'Ad tales autem miraculosos effectus, quos jactant tam Graeci quam Latini, credendos, aliquid nobis videtur deesse, scil. Christi promissio, aut mandatum. De his miraculis fama orta videtur ex absurda quadam credulitate, Spiritum Sanctum in elementorum naturam supernaturalem quandam vim infundere.' Allix. in notis ad Nectarium, p. 429. N.B. The question of inherent virtues had been thoroughly discussed by the best-learned Protestants, and the notion generally exploded, here and abroad, long before Dr. Grabe undertook (inadvertently perhaps, or however unadvisedly) to revive it.

['Grabium cujus ingenium novarum et portentosarum opinionum tenax nemini ignotum est.' Deyling. Observat. Miscell. p. 177.

'Nec tamen id dissimulamus, ipsum, antequam ad Anglos abiret, ad ecclesiam Romanam transire omnino voluisse, et quidem hanc praecipue ob rationem, quod crediderat, successionem episcopatus ministeriique apostolici in ea sola inveniri.' Pfaffius, p. 500.]

[c] Grabe's Defence of the Greek Church, p. 88.

[d] Grabe, ibid. pp. 75, 87. Cp. pp. 20, 35, 90, 91.

spirit; but of those to their condemnation and destruction of soul and body[e].'

Whoever looks into Scripture, or genuine antiquity, will there find but very little ground or colour for these or the like speculations; which appear rather to have been borrowed from Damascen of the eighth century, or from the more modern Greeks, or the Pseudo-primitive liturgies. There was indeed, as early as the second century, some mention made of the descent of the Holy Ghost in Baptism[f]: and there was also a prevailing notion of some concurrence of the Holy Spirit with water, to the conception and birth of a Christian; which concurrence, by way of illustration, or to render the idea of it more lively and affecting, was sometimes compared to a conjugal union[g]. But it was never understood, that such similitudes were to be scanned with a scrupulous exactness; or that every affecting or popular expression should be strained with the utmost rigour: for that would be using the ancient writers in much such a way as the Anthropomorphites and others have interpreted Scripture, contrary to the true meaning and intent of it. The Fathers very well knew how to distinguish between a power adsistant to, or concurrent with the element[h], and a power infused into it, or lodged in it: and they were well aware of the difference between the virtue of Baptism (meaning the whole solemnity, in which God bears a part[i]) and the inherent virtue of the consecrated water, which means quite

[e] Grabe's Defence of the Greek Church, p. 87.

N.B. The Leipsic Acts, in their censure upon that posthumous piece, first published in 1721, have left this note:

'Ex his vero patet, quod licet in articulo de coena, alienam a pontificiorum transubstantiatione sententiam habuerit Grabius, tamen in eodem ab Anglicana etiam . . . Ecclesia haud parum discrepaverit.' Act Lips. p. 281. A.D. 1722.

[f] See my Review, above, pp. 250—260.

[g] Tertullian. de Baptismo. Chrysostom. in Ephes. Hom. xx. p. 147. Leo I. Serm. 23, 24, pp. 155, 160. Quesnell. Pseud-Ambros. de Myst. cap. lix. p. 243. See more testimonies in Vossius, Opp. tom. vi. pp. 233, 274. Cp. Albertinus, pp. 465, 466, and my Appendix, pp. 452, 453.

[h] *Διττὴ καὶ ἡ κάθαρσις, δι' ὕδατός τε, φημὶ, καὶ πνεύματος· τοῦ μὲν θεορητῶς καὶ σωματικῶς λαμβανομένου, τοῦ δὲ ἀσωμάτως καὶ ἀθεωρήτως συντρέχοντος.* Nazianz. Orat. xl. p. 641. Compare Review, above pp. 257—260.

[i] See my Review, above p. 11, &c.

another thing, and is a late invention of dark and ignorant ages [k].

As to the Eucharist, for the three first centuries, and part of the fourth, nothing at all was said, so far as appears, of any descent of the third Person upon the elements [l]; nothing of his forming them into Christ's body; no, nor of his forming the natural body in the womb: but the ancients interpreted Luke i. 35, of our Lord's own Divine Spirit, namely, of the Logos, and supposed that the same Logos formed for himself a body in the womb [m]. So little foundation is there, within the three first and purest ages, for the pretended similitude between the Holy Ghost's forming the natural body in the womb, and his forming the spiritual body in the Eucharist [n]. The similitude made use of anciently with respect to the Eucharist, was that of the incarnation [o], intended only in a confuse, general way, and not for any rigorous exactness. For like as our Lord, in his incarnation, made and fitted for himself a natural body to dwell in; so, in regard to the Eucharist, he has appointed and fitted for himself a symbolical body to

[k] 'Sacramenta continere gratiam nunquam olim dictum: itaque Thomas, parte tertia quaestionis sexagesimae secundae, articulo tertio, non potuit altius arcessere quam ab Hugone de Sancto Victore.' Chamier. Panstrat. tom. iv. p. 52. N.B. Hugo flourished about A.D. 1120, [or 1130.]

['Hugo de S. Victore dicit, quod Sacramentum ex sanctificatione invisibilem gratiam continet.' Aquin. par. 3. q. 62. art. 3. p. 138.

'Sacramentum est corporale vel materiale elementum . . . ex sanctificatione continens invisibilem et spiritualem gratiam.' Hugo de S. Vict. t. iii. de Sacramentis, par. 9. c. 1. p. 405.

'Dona enim gratiae spiritualia quasi quaedam invisibilia antidota sunt, quae dum in sacramentis visibilibus, quasi quibusdam vasculis, homini porriguntur, quid aliud quam ex patenti specie virtus occulta ostenditur?' p. 406. ed. Colon. 1617.]

[l] See my Review, above p. 261, &c.

[m] Hermas, lib. iii. Simil. 5. Just. Apol. i. p. 54. Dial. 354. Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 1. p. 293. Clem. Alex. p. 654. Tertullian, contr. Prax. cap. xxvi. de Carn. Christi, p. 18. Hippolytus, contr. Noet. cap. iv. p. 9. cap. xvii. p. 18. Novatian, cap. xix. [xxiv.] Cyprian, de Idol. Vanit. p. 228. Lactant. lib. iv. cap. 12. Hilarius, de Trin. 1011, 1044, 1047. Gregorius Boeticus, apud Ambros. tom. ii. pp. 354, 356, [*καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἥνωται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου ἑνούμεθα.* Chrysost. in 1 Cor. Hom. 24. p. 213.]

[n] [Abp. Cranmer, pp. 338, 340, 341, 355.]

[o] Justin. Apol. xcvi. Dial. p. 290. Compare my Doctrinal Use, &c. p. 405, and Review, above pp. 144, 145, and Albertinus, pp. 296, 664.

concur with, in the distributing his graces and blessings to the faithful receivers. As to the third Person, his more immediate presence and energy was by the ancients assigned to Baptism, correspondently to the figure of the conjugal union, as before hinted: while to the Eucharist was assigned the more immediate presence and energy of the Logos, as the figure of the incarnation, made use of in that case, justly required. It would be a kind of solecism in ancient language, to speak of the Holy Ghost in this matter, as some late writers have done; because it would be confounding the analogy which the truly ancient Doctors went upon in their doctrine of the two Sacraments. The very learned and judicious Bishop Bull gives a reasonable account of what was taught concerning the Eucharist in the early days of Justin and Irenaeus:

'By or upon the sacerdotal benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a Divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants: and therefore they are said to be, and are, the body and blood of Christ, the same Divinity which is hypostatically united to the body of Christ in heaven, being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine [p].' Here it is observable, that by Spirit of Christ Bishop Bull could not mean the third Person, but the Logos [q], which only is hypostatically united to the humanity of Christ; and that that Spirit is not said to reside in the elements, but to accompany them, and to the worthy only: so that the virtual union can amount only to an union of concurrence, (not of infusion or inherence,) whereby Christ is

[p] Bull's Answer to the Bishop of Meaux, pp. 21, 22. How different Bishop Bull's account is from Dr. Grabe's in his notes on Irenaeus, will be obvious to every one who will be at the pains to compare them: though at the same time Bishop Bull very respectfully refers to Dr. Grabe (p. 23) for clearing the point against the Romanists.

[On earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is prayed, that God would send down his Spirit upon the bread and wine in the Eucharist, p. 22, alias 246. Cp. Spalatens. l. v. c. 6. p. 85. Salmas. p. 395.]

[q] How common and familiar such use of the name Spirit, or Holy Spirit, anciently was, may be understood from the interpretation of Luke i. 35, as before mentioned, and from the testimonies collected to that purpose by learned men. Grotius in Marc. ii. 8. Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. cap. ii. sect. 5. Constant. in Hilar. praefat. p. 19.

conceived to concur with the elements, in the due use of them to produce the effects in persons fitly disposed. All which is true and ancient doctrine.

In the fourth century, some illapse[r] of the third Person upon the elements was commonly taught, and that justly, provided it be but as justly understood. Not so as to make the sacramental body a compound of element and spirit, after the way of the modern Greeks; nor so as to make the third Person the proper food of the Eucharist, or the 'res Sacramenti;' for the Logos was always considered as the food there spiritually given and received[s]; yea it was the incarnate Logos[t], and therein stands our mystical union with Christ as improved and strengthened in that Sacrament. But the work of the Holy Ghost upon the elements[u] was to translate or change them from common to

[r] [The illapse of the second Person was prayed for likewise. 'Sacerdotes quoque qui dant baptismum, et ad Eucharistiam Domini imprecantur adventum, faciunt oleum chrismatis, manum imponunt.' Hieron. in Sophon. iii. p. 1673. 'Crede adesse Dominum Jesum, invocatum precibus sacerdotum.' Pseud. Ambr. de iis qui mysteriis initiantur. c. 5. But vid. Missal. Gallican. in Pfaffio 383. This relates to baptism.

The whole Trinity sometimes invoked. Vid. Justin. Apol. 96. Cyrill. Mystag. 1. t. vii. p. 308. Cp. Pfaffius, 384, 385, 399.

'Improprie ergo, in Sacramentis participandis, verbo carne vesci dicimur, cum carne tantum per verbum facta vivificante vescamur. Sed nec ipsam carnem proprie sumimus, quae in pane sanctificato sub sacramento nobis communicatur.' Salmasius, contra Grot. p. 156.]

[s] Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 38. p. 284. Clemens Alex. 123, 125, 126, 177, 178. Tertullian. de Orat. cap. 6. De Resurr. Carn. cap. 38. Origen. in Levit. Hom. xvi. p. 266. in Matt. p. 254. Novat. cap. 14, 16. Hilarius de Trin. lib. viii. p. 954. Nazianzen, Orat. iii. p. 70.

[t] Tertullian. de Resurr. Carn. cap. 37. Origen. in Matt. p. 254. Augustin. in Psal. xxxiii. p. 211. cxx. p. 1381. Compare Jewel's Answer to Hard. art. viii. p. 293, and Albertinus, pp. 341, 758.

[u] ['1. Papists say, the Holy Ghost transubstantiates the elements.

'2. Lutherans, that he unites them with the natural body locally present.

'3. Modern Greeks, that he fills them with himself, or with his grace or energy.

'4. Ancients, that he makes them exhibitive symbols of Christ's body locally absent, and of all the benefits accruing from it, conveying them to the communicants in the use of the symbols. They are changed—They have a dignity and pre-eminence which they had not before—They are not now common bread or common wine, but the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. A holy mystery—a covenant—a testimony—a perfect seal and sufficient warrant of God's promises,' &c. Jewel, Treatise of the Sacraments, p. 274. ed. 1611.

'Consecratio nullam pani et vino mutationem inducit nisi ut ex his fiat per eam sacramentum. Fides deinde sacramentum digne accipi-

sacred, from elements to sacraments, from their natural state and condition to supernatural ends and uses, that they might become holy signs, certain pledges, or exhibitive symbols of our Lord's own natural body and blood in a mystical and spiritual way. Not that any change was presumed, either as to the substance or the inward qualities of the elements, but only as to their outward state, condition, uses, or offices. For like as when a commoner is advanced into a peer, or a subject into a prince, or an house into a church, or a laic into a priest or prelate, there is a change of outward state, condition, circumstances, and there are new uses and offices, new prerogatives, new glories, but no change of substance, no, nor of inward qualities implied: such also is the case (only in a more eminent degree) with respect to the elements of the Eucharist; when they are consecrated by the priest, when they are sanctified by the Holy Ghost, when they are rendered relatively holy, when they are transferred from common to sacred [x], when they are exalted from mean and low uses, in comparison, to the highest and holiest purposes that such poor things could ever be advanced to. Such a change, or transmutation, as I have now mentioned, frequently occurs in the primitive writers: more than this (I am competently assured) will not be found in any certain and undoubted monuments of Catholic writers, within the first six centuries [y].

entis facit ut spiritaliter illud percipiat: id est, ut spiritali ejus virtuti communicet, et Spiritus Dei particeps existat. Nec huic veritati obstat, quod Patres saepe *δύναμιν ἄρτου* appellent, &c. Non enim intelligunt eam esse panis virtutem, aut pani inesse, sed quia cum pane simul accipitur ab eo qui digne eam accipit.' Salmasius, p. 429.]

[x] 'Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum.' Augustin. in Joann. Tract. 80.

[y] Compare Jewel's Def. of Apol. part ii. pp. 243, 244. Albertinus, pp. 425, 509. Cosin. Histor. Transubst. pp. 109, 113, 124. Covel. Account of Gr. Church, pp. 47, 53, &c. 67, 68, 72.

['When Gelasius speaks of the going of the sacraments into the divine substance, he meaneth not that the substances of the sacraments go into the substance of God, but that in the action of that mystery, to them that worthily receive the sacraments, to them they be turned into the Divine substance, through the working of the Holy Ghost, who maketh the godly receivers to be partakers of the Divine nature and substance.' Cranmer, 356. cp. 358. N.B. The outward change as to relative holiness, belongs to the elements, but the inward change to the persons only.]

So long as symbolical language was well remembered and rightly understood, and men knew how to distinguish between figure and verity, between signs and things: while due care and judgment was made use of, to interpret the literal expressions of Scripture and Fathers literally, and figurative expressions according to the figure: I say, while these things were so, there could be no room for imagining any change in the elements, either as to substance or internal qualities, nor for supposing that our Lord's words, 'This is my body,' were to be otherwise interpreted than those parallel words of the Apostle, 'that rock was Christ[z].' For as the word 'Christ,' which is the predicate in one proposition, is to be literally understood, and the trope lies in the verb 'was,' put for 'signified,' or exhibitively signified; so the word 'body,' which is the predicate in the other proposition, is to be literally interpreted of the natural or personal body of Christ, and the trope lies in the verb 'is[a],' put for 'represents,' or exhibitively signifies. And as it would not be right to say that the rock was a spiritual Christ, distinct from the real Christ, making two Christs; so neither can it be right to say or conceive that the bread in the Eucharist is a spiritual body of Christ, making two true bodies of Christ. But as the rock was a symbol of the one true Christ, so is the sacramental bread a symbol exhibitive of the one true body of Christ, viz. the natural or personal body, given and received in the Eucharist: I say, given and

[z] 1 Cor. x. 4. 'Solet autem res quae significat, ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari. . . . Hinc est quod dictum est, petra erat Christus. Non enim dixit, petra significat, sed tanquam hoc esset; quod utique per substantiam hoc non erat, sed per significationem. Sic et sanguis, quoniam animam significat in Sacramentis, anima dictus est.' Augustin. in Levit. q. lvii. p. 516. tom. 3. Cp. Epist. xcviii. ad Bonifac. p. 268. tom. 2. and my Review, above chap. 7. pp. 129—148.

'Sacramentorum enim natura et usitata loquendi ratio postulare videtur, ut symbolis non solum nomina, sed et eorum proprietates, imo effecta tribuantur.' Cosin. Histor. Transubst. p. 3.

[a] See this proved at large in Chamier's Panstrat. tom. iv. pp. 528, 529, &c. Albertinus, pp. 525, 526, 686. Jewel's Def. of Apol. p. 209. Answ. to Hard. pp. 238, 239, 255, 267. Spalatensis, lib. v. cap. 6. n. 73. 169. Cosin. Histor. Transubstant. pp. 10, 24, 30, 41, 43, 44. Compare my Review, above pp. 105—107, 151, 152, 164.

received spiritually [b], but truly and really; and the more truly, because spiritually, as the spiritual sense, and not the literal, is the true sense [c].

The ancient notion of this matter might easily be cleared from Father to Father, through the earlier centuries; and, I presume, I have competently done it elsewhere [d]. Therefore I shall here content myself with a single passage of Macarius, of the fourth century, which very briefly, but fully, expresses what all the rest mean. He observes, 'that bread and wine are offered in the Church as symbols (or antitypes) of our Lord's body and blood, and that they who partake of the visible bread, do spiritually eat the flesh of our Lord [e].' He is to be understood of worthy partaking; as Albertinus has shewn [f], and as reason requires. And when he speaks of the Lord's flesh, he cannot be understood of any spiritual flesh locally present in the Eucharist, but of the natural body and blood spiritually given and received, whereof the sacramental body and blood are the symbols, or antitypes, in his account. Such was the doctrine prevailing in his time, and three centuries, at least, longer [g].

But in the declension of the seventh century, some began to speak very oddly of the elements, as being literally made, by consecration, the very body and blood of Christ, not images

[b] [The doctrine of eating spiritually was preserved even in Pasch. Radbert. Opp. pp. 1567, 1570, 1571, 1583, 1626.]

[c] Compare my Review, above pp. 170, 273. Jewel's Answer to Hard. pp. 238, 241, 251, 256, 292. Bilson's Christian Subject, p. 631.

[d] Review, above chap. 6, and 7.

[e] "Οτι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσφέρεται ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος ἀντίτυπον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἵματος, καὶ ὅτι οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἐκ τοῦ φαινομένου ἄρτου, πνευματικῶς τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίουσι. Macar. Homil. xxvii. p. 164. Cp. Albertin. pp. 437, 438, 439.

[f] Albertinus, p. 440.

[g] [That doctrine was preserved in the old English or Saxon Church down to the 10th or 11th century, as appears from Aelfric, who thus speaks in his Saxon Homily on Easter-day:

'We do now spiritually (ȝaſtlice) receive or eat Christ's body, and drink his blood, when we receive (or eat) with true belief, that holy housel (huſel).' p. 3. ed. Lisle.

'Non sit tamen sacramentum corpus ejus in quo passus est pro nobis, nec sanguis ejus quem * pro nobis effudit, sed spiritualiter corpus ejus efficitur et sanguis, sicut manna quod de caelo pluit, et aqua quae de petra fluxit.' Aelfric. Ep. ad Wulstan. Wanley. 58. ann. circiter 950 et 941.]

or antitypes at all [h], as used to be taught aforetime. From thence we may reasonably date all the confusion and perplexity which has since so clouded and embarrassed the theory of this Sacrament.

When learning, language, and taste fell to decay, and men became as much strangers to the sublime of their forefathers, as to the symbolical majesty of the sacred style, then came up a lean, dry, sapless kind of theology, mightily degenerated from the just and elevated sentiments of former ages [i]. There was a branch of the Eutychians, who in consequence of their main principle of a confusion of the two natures of Christ, (making the human and divine nature one,) thought themselves obliged to maintain, that the body of Christ was, from the very moment of his conception, altogether incorruptible. From this error of theirs they had the Greek name of aphthartodocetae [k], and aphthartistae, *ἀφθαρτισταί*, and the Latin one of incorrupticolae, and from one Gaianus, a chief leader amongst them, they had some of them the name of Gaianites. Against those Gaianites, one Anastasius (a monk of Mount Sinai about the year 689 [l]) happened to engage: and amongst other topics of argumentation, he made choice of one drawn from the Eucharist. He had

[h] Yet it has been thought, that while they rejected the names of 'figure,' 'type,' and 'image,' they or their followers admitted of the names of 'symbol' and 'representation.' See Claude, book iv. chap. 10. pp. 341, 344. Which, if true, shews only how confused those men were, both in language and notion.

[But they seem to have used 'type' and 'symbol' promiscuously, and to have rejected them both. *Οὐκ εἶπε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σύμβολον τοῦ σώματός μου, καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ αἵματός μου, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου· διδάσκων ἡμᾶς μὴ πρὸς τὴν φύσιν ὁρᾶν τοῦ προκειμένου, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς γενομένης εὐχαριστίας εἰς σάρκα καὶ αἷμα μεταβάλλεσθαι.* Theodor. Mopsuest. in Possini Catena in Matt. xxvi. 26. p. 350.]

[i] 'Literam sequi, et signa pro rebus [quae iis significantur] accipere, servilis infirmitatis est.' Augustin. de Doctrin. Christian. lib. iii. c. 9. p. 49.

[k] *Ἀφθαρτοδοκήται.* Vide Damascen. Haeres. lxxxiv. p. 107.

[l] Between 677 and 686. Fabric. Bibl. Graec. vol. ix. pp. 313, [685. Oudin. t. i. p. 1663.]

[In the 11th century arose another dispute, namely, whether the consecrated elements were themselves corruptible. So that the very premises on which Anastasius built his argument for the corruptible nature of the thing signified was disputed. For since our Lord's body was held incorruptible, it was now pretended that the eucharistical body, being the same, was incorruptible also. Vide Salmasius, p. 344, the natural consequence of transubstantiation.]

learned, or might have learned from Catholic teachers, that by the operation of the Holy Spirit the elements are changed into the body of Christ, meaning the symbolical body; that is, changed into sacraments, or holy signs: and he had learned also, that the worthy communicants do partake of the natural body of Christ, the thing signified; that is, spiritually, mystically, symbolically, partake of it. These two propositions he confusedly remembered, or rather ignorantly misunderstood, and so he blended them both into this one; that the elements themselves upon consecration become, not in signification, but in reality, the natural body of Christ: which amounted to saying, that, instead of exhibitive signs, they become the very things signified. Under such confusion of thought, he formed his argument against the Gaianites[m] in this manner: 'The consecrated elements are no types or figures, but they are the very body and blood of our Lord; and they are corruptible, as will appear upon experiment: therefore our Lord's body, before his resurrection, was also corruptible[n],' which was to be proved[o]. To confirm his notion that the elements are no types or figures, but the very body, he pleaded, that our Lord, in the institution, said not, This is the figure [antitype] of my body, but 'This is my body[p].' An argument by which he

[m] ['Videntur isti homines credidisse omnem panem communem esse antitypum corporis Christi, quia Christus in pane sacramenta constituit sui corporis: at post consecrationem, cum desinat esse communis panis et simplex, desinere esse antitypum corporis, quia jam sit ipsum corpus.' Salmas. pp. 340, 341.]

[n] 'Ὁ ὀρθόδοξος. εἰπέ μοι, παρακαλῶ ... αὐτὴ ἡ κοινωνία καὶ θυσία τοῦ παναγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ ἣν προσφέρεις καὶ μεταλαμβάνεις, σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἀληθινόν ἐστι Χριστοῦ, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ψιλὸς ἄρτος ὡς ὁ πιπρασκόμενος κατ' οἶκον, καὶ ἀντίτυπος τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἡ θυσία τοῦ τράγου ἣν Ἰουδαῖοι προσάγουσιν;

'Ο Γαιανίτης· μὴ γένοιτο ἡμᾶς εἰπεῖν ἀντίτυπον τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν κοινωνίαν, ἢ ψιλὸν ἄρτον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἀληθῶς Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνομεν, τοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ γεννηθέντος ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.

[o] ['Frivolum et ineptum est argumentum: ex re sequeretur imaginem cujuslibet rei aut personae iisdem vitiis plane esse obnoxiam ut ipsum architypum, vel ipsa res cujus est imago. ... At illi negant panem eucharistiae, quem corruptibilem asseverant, esse ἀντίτυπον corporis Christi. Sed quod negant, res ipsa, velint nolint, ostendit.' Salmasius, p. 343.]

[p] 'Ὁ ὀρθόδοξος. οὕτω πιστεύομεν, καὶ οὕτως ὁμολογοῦμεν, κατὰ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ ... τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα. ... οὐκ εἶπε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἀντίτυπον σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματός μου. Anastas. Hodeg. c. xxiii. pp. 349, 350.

might as easily have proved, that the rock in the wilderness was the very Christ: for St. Paul said not that the rock signified Christ, or was a symbol of Christ; but he declared in express words, that 'that rock was Christ[q].' It is hard to say what precise ideas that author had of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or what he really meant; if indeed he went further than the sound of words. Albertinus conjectures, from his occasionally mentioning the descent of the Holy Spirit, that he conceived the consecrated elements to become the very body, because the same Spirit was imparted to them as to the natural body of our Lord; a notion not falling in with transubstantiation or consubstantiation, but amounting to some kind of impanation[r]. If so, he may be looked upon, according to what appears, as the first inventor of the spiritual bread-body, or first founder of that system. But I much question whether that notion can claim so early a date. Whatever conception the author had of the elements, as made the very body and blood of Christ, yet (so far as we may judge from some passages of another work of the same author, first published by Dr. Allix in 1682[s],) he did not conceive that the elements were enriched, either with the Spirit himself, or with the graces of the Spirit:

N.B. That weak way of reasoning has been since fathered upon several older writers; as Origen, Magnes, Theodorus Heracleotes, Theodorus Mopsuestenus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, and others: but those and the like passages appear to be all fictitious, imposed upon those earlier writers by some later Greeks. See Albertinus, pp. 367, 420, 769, 770, &c. 893.

[The Greeks that came later, Nicephorus, Theodorus Graptus, Samonas, Marcus Ephesius, Theophylactus, Miletius, &c., followed the same scent. See Pfaffius, pp. 141, 142. And so Pasch. Radbert. in Matth. p. 1626.]

[q] 1 Cor. x. 4.

[r] 'Mens ipsius videtur esse, panem et vinum eatenus esse verum Christi corpus et sanguinem, quatenus idem Spiritus qui proprio Domini corpori et sanguini inest, se pani et vino similiter communicat: qui certe monachi hujus conceptus nihil habet commune cum transubstantiatione, aut consubstantiatione, sed impanationis cujusdam, ab aliis post clarius expositae, speciem quandam habet.' Albertin. p. 906. Cp. Claude, lib. iv. c. 9. pp. 331–336.

[N.B. After that transubstantiation took place, many denied that the consecrated elements were corruptible. This happened in the 11th century, near four hundred years after Anastasius. 1066. Vid. Guitmund. t. ii. p. 447.]

[s] 'S. Anastasii Sinaitae Anagogicarum contemplationum in Hexaemeron, liber xii. hactenus desideratus.' Lond. 1682. Cp. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. vol. ix. p. 328.

for he distinguished between the bread from heaven, viz. the Logos, given to the worthy only, and carrying eternal life with it, and the earth-born flesh of Christ, viz. the consecrated elements, common both to worthy and unworthy, and having no such promise of eternal life annexed to it[t], in John vi. 51. I will not answer for the acuteness, much less for the soundness of his distinction. He found himself entangled presently, only by reading a few verses further in the same chapter, where eternal life is annexed to the eating of the flesh and drinking the blood, as well as before to the manducation of the bread from heaven, which he had interpreted of the Divine nature of Christ. Here he was in straits, and retired in confusion, leaving his readers in the dark; but referring them for instruction to men more knowing, and more equal to the difficulty than he pretended to be: only he seemed to aim at some blind distinction between the earth-born visible flesh[u] which the unworthy partake of, and the mystical flesh[x] which belonged to the worthy only, and which it was very difficult[y] to make any sense or consistency of, upon his principles. He had discarded signs as such, and had resolved all into the things signified, viz. the real flesh and blood of Christ: and now he

[t] Ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος· καὶ ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.... ἀκούεις περὶ διαφορᾶς βρώσεως· ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνοντος τοὺς ἐσθίοντας εἶπεν ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς σαρκὸς, οὐ τέθηκε τοῦτο.... διττῶς μετέχομεν τῶν μυστηρίων. Οἱ μὲν ἄξιοι ἐκείνων ἀπολάβουσι τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ καταβαίνοντος αἰεὶ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῆς ἐνοικήσεως καὶ ἐκλάμψεως τοῦ παναγίου. πατρὸς τῆς θεότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς τὰ θεῖα καὶ οὐράνια φρονοῦντες· οἱ δὴ γήινοι καὶ τὰ γήινα φρονοῦντες, τῆς γηγενοῦς καὶ μόνης σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταλαμβάνουσιν τολμηρῶς καὶ ἀναξίως. Anastas. Hexaem. lib. xii. p. 18.

[u] Οὐ περὶ τῆς ὁρωμένης αὐτῷ [fort. αὐτοῦ] σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος λέγει· μετέλαβε γὰρ καὶ Ἰούδας, καὶ Σίμων ὁ Μάγος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Anastas. ibid. p. 19.

[x] Τίς δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀληθὴς βρῶσις τῆς μυστικῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τί τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ κρυπτόμενον ἀπόρρητον αἷμα αὐτοῦ, καταλιμπάνομεν τοῖς ἱκανωτέροις καὶ γνωστικωτέροις, οἷς χρὴ μεταδιδοῦσιν. p. 19.

[y] ['Ut quotidie de novo creetur infinitis in locis corpus Christi corruptibile, cum sanguine pariter corruptibili, et separato a proprio corpore, ut effusus est ex latere ejus in cruce, id vero nullo modo credibile dictu est, nec possibile factu.... Non mirum est porro Graeculos istos neotericos doctores in re obscura exponenda, variis semetipsos implicasse contradictionibus.' Salmas. pp. 345, 346.]

wanted a distinction, in order to explain what was received by the unworthy, and what by the worthy, but found none; except it were this, that the unworthy received the corruptible flesh and blood of Christ, separate from his Divinity, while the worthy received both together. This is all the sense I can make of his notion[z]: and I pretend not to be certain even of this[a]. Neither would I have dwelt so long upon so obscure and unintelligible a writer, had he not been the first, or among the first, that threw off the old distinctions between the symbolical and true body, thereby destroying, in a great measure, the very idea of a Sacrament. Hitherto the new notion of the elements being made the real body, as opposed to image or figure, had been used only for the support of true doctrine as to other points. But it is always wrong policy (to say no worse) to endeavour to support sound doctrine by any thing unsound, or to defend truth by any thing but truth. Error, first or last, will infallibly turn on the side of error, and cannot naturally serve for any other purpose. So it proved in this case: for the next time that this new doctrine appeared upon the stage was in the service of image-worship, then creeping into the Church. They who

[z] [See the weakness and inconsistency of the notion fully exposed in Salmasius, p. 345, &c.

'Isti volunt ex pane, corruptionis omnia labi obnoxio, confici corpus Christi frangendum, similiter ut in cruce ipse fractus est, et multis aliis praeterea vitiis mucoris, putrefactionis, verminationis corrumpendum, quae non sensit tum corpus Christi: ... Quod non solum est ἀτοπώτατον, sed etiam maxime impium cogitatu. Non mirum est porro Graeculos istos,' &c. Ibid. pp. 345, 346.]

[a] As errors commonly are the corruption of truth, and retain some of the original features; so one may see in Anastasius's notion some resemblances of the ancient doctrines, miserably perverted or misunderstood.

1. He had learned that the Spirit makes the body of Christ: he interpreted it of the natural body, instead of symbolical, viz. the sacrament of the true body.

2. He had learned that the natural body is given and received: he interpreted it literally, instead of mystically, or spiritually.

3. He had learned that the natural body eaten, is considered as corruptible, crucified and dead, and not as glorified: that he retained, and justly.

4. He had learned, that the flesh profiteth not, and that the unworthy partake not either of the 'Logos,' or Holy Ghost, but that the worthy partake of both: and those also he appears to have retained.

Upon the whole, he blundered only in two of the propositions: but those two mistakes, like the flies in the ointment, marred the composition, and corrupted his whole system of the Eucharist.

opposed that innovation, kept up the ancient principle with regard to the elements of the Eucharist, as symbols, figures, images; pleading that our Lord had left no visible image of himself, his incarnation, passion, sacrifice, &c. but that of the Eucharist. In reply to that plea, the innovators remonstrated against the symbolical nature of the Eucharist, contending that the consecrated elements were no images, types, or figures, but the very body and blood of Christ, literally so.

John Damascen, surnamed Mansur, the father of the modern Greeks, and their great oracle, was in this sentiment; a very considerable man otherwise, and worthy of better times [b]. He had read the Fathers, who were pointed against him; which however signified little to a person already embarked in a wrong cause: for it is certain, and might be proved by many instances, that men who have any affection stronger than their love of truth, will never want evasions against any evidence whatever. He pretended that the ancients [c] had called the elements types, or figures, only before consecration, never after [d]. A plea notoriously false in fact, as all learned men know [e]: and had he said just the reverse, viz. that the Fathers had never so called them before consecration, but always after, he had come much nearer to the truth. The elements, before they are consecrated, are common things: and it is their consecration only that renders them figures, signs, symbols, sacraments. To pretend therefore that they are signs or symbols before consecration, is making them sacraments before they are sacraments, and carries a contradiction in the very terms [f]. If the Fathers have ever so called them, which is questioned, it could amount only to

[b] Damascen flourished about A.D. 740. Died about A.D. 756. Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Graec. tom. viii. p. 774.

[c] ['Locutiones figurae, imaginis, et antitypi, aliquid mutationis octavo saeculo apud Graecos accepisse facile conceperim.' Simon. not. ad Gabr. Sever. 230.]

[d] Damascen. de Rect. Fid. lib. iv. c. 13. pp. 271, 273, edit. Lequ. [Cf. Conc. Nicen. ii. Act. vi. p. 370. Hard.]

[e] See Albertinus, pp. 904, 907, 911, 912, 915. Jewel's Answer to Hard. art. xii. p. 335. Def. of Apol. p. 243. Bilson's Christian Subject, pp. 594, 595. L'Arroque's Hist. of the Euch. part ii. p. 213, &c. 368, &c. [Salmasius de Transubst. contra Grot. pp. 338, 339, &c. Simon. not. in Gabr. Philadelph. p. 230. Pfaffius in Iren. Fragm. p. 140.]

[f] [Vid. Jewel, Answer to Hard. p. 335. Salmasius, pp. 341, 445.]

some chance expression, contrary to their customary language, and to be accounted for by the figure called a prolepsis, as done by way of anticipation.

However, Damascen persisted in his error, that the consecrated elements are no type or figure, but the very 'deified body of our Lord[g].' If you ask, who makes them so? he sometimes tells you, the second Person does it, like as he formed for himself a personal body in the womb[h]: and sometimes[i] he says, that the third Person does it, like as he also, overshadowing the Virgin, formed the same body in the womb[k]. Thus he drew together the two constructions of Luke i. 35, one prevailing principally before the fourth century[l], and the other after[m]: and he reconciled the two positions handsomely enough, by observing, that the second Person operates by the third.

But still he was well aware, that whatever person should be supposed to make the body in the womb, yet nothing could make that body properly our Lord's body, but our Lord's assuming it into an union with himself: the forming an human and a sanctified body would not be making that body Christ's body: and, for the like reason, the Holy Ghost's so forming

[g] Οὐκ ἔστι τύπος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τεθεωμένον. Damascen. de Rect. Fid. lib. iv. c. 13. p. 271.

[h] Damascen, ibid. p. 268.

[i] ['Paulus Diaconus Aquileiensis A.D. 785. Praescius conditor noster infirmitatis nostrae, ea potestate qua cuncta fecit ex nihilo, et corpus sibi ex carne semper-virginis, operante Sancto Spiritu, fabricavit, panem et vinum aqua mixtum, manente propria specie, in carnem et sanguinem suum, ad catholicam fidem, ob reparationem nostram Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione convertit.' In Vit. Gregorii M. Then Paulus reports a pretended miracle of Gregory, to convert a woman and to confirm the doctrine.]

[k] Damascen, ibid. p. 269. Epist. ad Zachar. Ep. Duarorum, p. 656. [Cp. Pasch. Radb. c. 3. p. 1563. iv. 1565. 1588. Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. 2. Paulus Diaconus in Vit. Gregor. I. A.D. 734. Missal. Goth. in Missa Leudegarii A.D. 780. Steph. Advers. A.D. 1113.]

[l] See above, p. 490.

[m] It may be noted, that when πνεῦμα ἅγιον, in that verse came at length to be interpreted of the third Person, yet δύναμις ὑψίστου continued to be interpreted of the second, namely of the Λόγος. Athanasius, Orat. iv. pp. 642, 695. Basil. contr. Eunom. lib. v. p. 318. Ambros. de Sp. Sancto, lib. ii. c. 5. Ruffin. in Symb. p. 20. ed. Oxon. Philastrius, cap. cl. p. 345. Augustin. contr. Maxim. lib. iii. c. 15. Leo I. Serm. xxi. p. 147. Damascen, pp. 204, 658. Theophylact in loc. [Euseb. in Isai. p. 385. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. 17. c. 6. p. 266. Gregor. Nazianz. Or. 38, et 42. Marius Victorin. contr. Arian. l. i. Gregor. Moral. l. xciii. c. 12. Homil. in Evang. 33. Beda in loc.]

and so sanctifying the elements would not be converting them into, or making them, the body and blood of Christ, but merely a sanctified body. Therefore Damascen proceeded further to affirm [n], that our Lord makes the elements his body and blood, by joining his Divinity with them: and it is observable, that while he thought the grace of the Spirit sufficient for the elements of oil and water, in Chrism and Baptism, yet he judged that nothing less than Christ's own Divinity could make the elements of the Eucharist Christ's body and blood. Had he thought of this in time, he might have spared his two previous considerations, about the second and the third Person's forming or changing the elements into Christ's body, so improperly brought in; for it is now plain, by his own account, that the elements are not made Christ's body, but by Christ's assuming them into some kind of union with his Divinity; and all that was supposed previous could amount only to preparing them, fitting them, sanctifying them, in order to be made the body and blood of Christ. It could not amount to so much as forming them, like the body in the womb, though he had pretended that it did: for the bread and wine want no forming, (like the body in the womb,) having been formed before, and all along keeping their original forms. So that at length that pretended previous change could resolve only into a previous sanctification by the Spirit, upon his own principles: the Logos was to do the rest, by assuming those sanctified elements, and making them the body and blood of Christ. So confused and incoherent was this great man.

But what was worse still, after all these lengths of fancy, there was yet a difficulty remaining, which was altogether insuperable. The elements were to be made the very deified body of Christ, like as the personal body, in the womb, had been made. How could this be, without the like personal union of the elements with the Divinity? Here Damascen was

[n] *Συνέζευξε τῷ ἐλαίῳ καὶ ὕδατι τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος . . . ἐπειδὴ ἔθος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἄρτον ἐσθίειν, ὕδωρ τε καὶ οἶνον πίνειν, συνέζευξεν αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτοῦ θεότητα, καὶ πεποίηκεν αὐτὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῦ.* Damasc. p. 269.

plunged, and attempted not to get out, excepting only a few short hints, at that time, or in that work. But in another work, in the way of a private letter, he did endeavour to surmount the difficulty, by suggesting and enforcing a new piece of subtilty, that like as a man's body takes in daily additional matter, and all becomes one and the same body; so our Lord's personal body takes in all the new-made bodies of the Eucharist; and thus, by a kind of growth, or augmentation, all become one and the same personal body of Christ [o]. A marvellous thought! But he was wedded to a new scheme, and was in no disposition to return to the old principles, which might have eased him of all perplexities. The heart will commonly govern the head: and it is certain, that any strong passion, set the wrong way, will soon infatuate even the wisest of men: therefore the first part of wisdom is to watch the affections. But I pass on.

I am aware that the late learned editor of Damascen has disputed the genuineness of that epistle [p]. But the external evidences for it appear to me to outweigh the slight suspicions drawn from the internal characters. And I am much mistaken, if any unprejudiced examiner will find that the learned editor has proved any thing more than a strong desire to fetch off his author from some palpable absurdities, lest they should

[o] Damascen. Epist. ad Zachar. pp. 655–659. N.B. There is something of a like thought appearing in a work ascribed to Gregory Nyssen, Orat. Catechet. magn. c. xxxvii. p. 537. But there are strong suspicions that that work has been interpolated. It is certain, that there is, in the close, an addition from Theodorus Raithu, who flourished about A.D. 646. So that there is no depending upon the whole work as genuine; but there may be, and probably are interpolations in it, perhaps of the seventh or eighth century, or later. See Albertinus, p. 487. Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. tom. viii. p. 153. But if Nyssen really held any such notions, or used any such expressions, they were affected and singular, and ought to bear no weight against the known sentiments and common style of the Fathers in general.

[Damascen had hinted this matter before, in his book, l. iv. p. 270, but had not explicitly opened his meaning: *Ὥσπερ φυσικῶς διὰ τῆς βρώσεως ὁ ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ διὰ τῆς πόσεως εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ ἐσθίοντος καὶ πίνοντος μεταβάλλονται, καὶ γίνονται ἕτερον σῶμα παρὰ τὸ πρότερον αὐτοῦ σῶμα· οὕτως ὁ τῆς προθέσεως ἄρτος, οἶνός τε καὶ ὕδωρ, διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ὑπερφυῶς μεταποιοῦνται εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλ' ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτό.*]

[p] In admonitione Praevia, p. 652.

too much impair his credit as to other points. But, however that be, it is certain that Damascen's system wanted some such additional succour as that epistle endeavoured to supply: and whether he did the kind office himself, or some other did it for him, is of no great moment with respect to the main cause. One thing we may observe from the whole, that whosoever once embraces any great absurdity, and resolves to abide by it, must, if he will be consistent and uniform, proceed to more: and though to go on is a kind of madness, yet to stop short betrays more weakness and self-condemnation.

No transubstantiation (such as the Romanists hold) was yet invented. Damascen's doctrine was far enough from that [q]; excepting that it might accidentally and gradually lead to it, as indeed it did, by sapping those ancient principles which otherwise were sure barriers against it, and by setting men's minds afloat after new devices.

From Damascen we may pass on to the famous Council of Constantinople, which consisted of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, who assembled under Constantine the Sixth, surnamed Copronymus, A.D. 754. They, detesting all image-worship, reestablished the ancient doctrine of the elements being commemorative and exhibitive types, figures, symbols, or images of the natural body and blood of Christ; alleging that the Eucharist was the only image of Christ's incarnation which Christ had authorized in his Church [r]. They speak magnificently of the consecration, and the effects of it; the elements thereby becoming an holy image, and deified, as it were, by grace [s]: by which they appear to mean no more than divinely sanctified [t],

[q] Vid. Albertinus, pp. 912, 913. L'Arroque's Hist. of Euch. p. 366, &c. Claude against Arnaud, part i. book 4. chap. 9. p. 338. [And others referred to by Zornius, Histor. Eucharist. Infant. p. 457.]

[r] The whole passage may be seen in the Acts of the second Nicene Council, Act. vi. pp. 368, 369. Harduin, tom. iv. Compare Dr. Covel's translation of it, and remarks upon it; Account of Gr. Church, pp. 150, 151; and Albertinus, p. 914; and Claude, book iv. chap. 10. pp. 347–355.

[s] *Εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ ἁγία, ὡς διά τινος ἁγιασμοῦ, χάριτι θεουμένη.* p. 368.

[t] ['Consecrare idem est Latinis scriptoribus quod deum facere: ut de illis qui in numerum deorum referebantur, quae est Graecorum *ἀποθέωσις*.' Salmas. de Transubst. pp. 437, 439, 443.]

according to the ordinary use of such phrases, at that time, and before [u]: and they themselves explain it by its being made holy, when before it was common [x]. And though they speak of the elements being replenished [y], that is, sanctified by the Holy Ghost, yet they reserve the enlivening or life-giving virtue to the true and proper body and blood of Christ [z]; not to the elements, the image of them. They distinguish between the real, natural body, and the relative body, or body by institution and appointment [a]. The meaning of the latter must be determined by what it is appointed to; which the Council itself sufficiently explains: it is appointed to be a true image, and a most clear memorial of the natural body [b]: a true image, as opposed to bare representation, as in a picture, not exhibitive of, or accompanied with true and spiritual benefits: a very clear memorial, as opposed to the faint shadows and dark intimations of the legal types or figurations. Some further light perhaps may be given to the true meaning of those Constantinopolitan Fathers, by a short passage of the Emperor Copronymus, preserved by Nicephorus, who was Patriarch of Constantinople from 806 to 815. The passage runs thus:

[u] Vid. Suicer's Thesaur. tom. i. 444, 1363, 1392, 1398. Jewel's Answer to Hard. p. 247. Albertinus, p. 886. and compare Damascen. lib. iii. c. 17. p. 239.

[x] Τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἄρτον, ὡς ἀψευδῆ εἰκόνα τῆς φυσικῆς σαρκὸς διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἁγιαζόμενον, θεῖον σῶμα εὐδόκησε γίνεσθαι, μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ ἐν μετενέξει ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον, τὴν ἀναφορὰν ποιημένου ἱερέως. P. 368. ['Non enim *δύναμιν* aut virtutem divinam ex verbis consecrationis inditam esse pani crediderunt, quamvis et spiritum invocatum, de caelo descendere dixerunt, et adesse, et praesentia sua vegetare et implere species elementorum in mensa dominica positas.' Salmas. p. 443. Cp. 446.]

[y] ['Simulacra consecrari dicebantur, cum deus cui dedicabantur, in ea certis carminibus eliciebatur, ut divinitate sua illa repleret, et in simulacro deus ipse praesens haberi et coli videretur.' Idem, p. 438. Cp. 443.]

[z] Ζωοποιῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ . . . εἰκὼν τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ . . . σὺν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ ζωοφόρου αἵματος τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ. Note, that Mr. Johnson, inadvertently, rendered the last words, 'life-giving cup of the blood which [flowed] out of his side,' (Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 195;) he should have rendered, as Dr. Covel has done, 'the cup of the enlivening blood of his side:' which is different, and gives quite another idea to the main thing. Cp. Theodoret. Dial. ii. p. 85.

[a] Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα ἅγιον, ὡς θεωθέν· οὕτως δῆλον καὶ τὸ θέσει . . . p. 368. For the phrase, εἰκὼν κατὰ θέσιν, vid. Damascen. tom. i. p. 354.

[b] Ἀληθῆ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰκόνα . . . ἣν αὐτὸς ὁ ἱεροτελεστὴς καὶ Θεὸς . . . εἰς τύπον καὶ ἀνάμνησιν ἐναργεστάτην τοῖς αὐτοῦ μύσταις παραδέδωκε. P. 368.

'He commanded his holy disciples and apostles to deliver, by what thing he pleased, a symbol [type] for his body: that through the sacerdotal ministration we might receive really and truly, though it be by participation and designation, his very body[c].' The meaning, as I apprehend, is, that we partake of the natural body itself, in a true and reasonable sense, (that is, symbolically or spiritually,) by receiving what God has instituted as a symbol and instrument to convey it. Copronymus does not say, that the elements are really and truly that body: no, that was the very position of the adverse party. But he affirms that we truly and really receive that very body, though symbolically, or by an appointed medium and pledge of it: which I understand to be exactly the same doctrine that our Church teaches, viz. that the body and blood of Christ are 'verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper[d].' This doctrine did not happen to please the Nicene Fathers, who sat thirty-three years after, in the year 787. It was not sufficient to say, that by or with the elements we do verily and indeed receive Christ's body and blood, but the elements themselves must literally be the very body and the very blood of Christ, and not types or pledges only of it[e]. Not indeed in the sense of Papal transubstantiation, (which was not then thought on[f],) but in some such sense as Anastasius or Damascen had before recommended.

Seven years after (viz. A.D. 794) appeared the Caroline books, moderating in the dispute between the Councils of Constantinople and Nice. The author or authors of them determine that the Sacrament of our Lord's body and blood goes much beyond a picture of man's device, in many respects; which they hand-

[c] *Ἐκέλευσεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, παραδοῦναι δι' οὗ ἠράσθη πράγματος τύπον εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ. Ἵνα διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἀναγωγῆς, κἂν εἰ ἐκ μετοχῆς καὶ θέσει γίνηται, λάβωμεν αὐτό, ὡς κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, σῶμα αὐτοῦ.* Constantin. Copronym. in Notis ad Damascen. tom. i. p. 354. As to the ecclesiastical use and sense of the word *κυρίως*, see Albertinus, p. 461. Claude, part ii. p. 76.

[d] See my Review, above pp. 171, 273.

[e] *Οὔτε ὁ Κύριος, οὔτε οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἢ πατέρες εἰκόνα εἶπον . . . ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα. . . . μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν σῶμα κυρίως καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ λέγονται, καὶ εἰσὶ, καὶ πιστεύονται.* Concil. Nicen. ii. Act. vi. pp. 370, 371. Harduin, tom. iv.

[f] Vid. Albertinus, p. 915. Covel, pp. 151, 152.

somely enumerate[g]: and of that no man can doubt. They determine further, that the elements are not types of things future, nor faint shadows, like those under the law, but that they are truth and substance[h]; a sacrament and mystery, commemorative of a thing performed, and not prefigurative of a thing hoped for only, or promised: a sacrament directly and plainly signifying and exhibiting the true expiation, and not merely under the dark covers or remote innuendos of legal expiations. In short, the eucharistical symbols are not prefigurations of things expected, but evidences of things done, and memorials of mercies and blessings in hand, not in prospect only. Their whole meaning seems to be, that though the consecrated elements are really signs and symbols, (for so much they intimate in the words sacrament, mystery, and true image,) and therefore not the very body and blood, as many then taught; yet they are more than types, or prefigurations, or adumbrations, or even bare memorials, because they exhibit the things signified, and that not darkly or indirectly, (which even the Jewish sacraments did[i],) but directly and plainly, under the strongest light, and to greatest advantage. This doctrine is sound and good, and well guarded, in the main, against both extremes. Only, it might have been wished, that they had been less scrupulous about the use of the name figure[k], or

[g] 'Distat Sacramentum Dominici corporis et sanguinis ab imaginibus pictorum arte depictis, &c.' Carol. Magn. lib. ii. p. 278.

[h] 'Nec nobis legis transeuntibus umbris imaginarium quoddam indicium, sed sui sanguinis et corporis contulit Sacramentum. Non enim sanguinis et corporis Dominici mysterium imago jam nunc dicendum est, sed veritas; non umbra, sed corpus; non exemplar futurorum, sed id quod exemplaribus praefigurabatur. . . . Jam verus Melchizedech, Christus videlicet, rex justus, rex pacis, non pecudum victimas, sed sui nobis corporis et sanguinis contulit Sacramentum. Nec ait, Haec est imago corporis et sanguinis mei, sed Hoc est corpus meum . . . Cum ergo, ut praefati sumus, nec artificum opus, vera Christi possit imago dici, nec corporis et sanguinis ejus mysterium, quod in veritate gestum esse constat, non in figura, merito,' &c. Carol. Magn. de Imagin. lib. iv. p. 520. Cp. Albertin. pp. 916, 917. Jewel's Answer to Harduin, art. xii. pp. 344, 345. Bilson's Christian Subject, p. 593. Claude, part i. book v. chap. 9. pp. 96, 97. L'Arroque, p. 380, &c.

[i] 'Idem itaque in mysterio cibus et potus illorum qui noster, sed significatione idem, non specie: quia idem ipse Christus illis in petra figuratus, nobis in carne manifestatus.' Augustin. in Psal. lxxvii. p. 816.

[k] [These words were kept in the

image, (so common and familiar in elder times,) and that they had given less countenance to the novel and affected phrases then coming into vogue: for, generally speaking, ancient doctrine is best kept up by adhering strictly to ancient language; and new phrases at any time, taken up without necessity, have been observed to lead the way to a new faith.

Hitherto, however, the western parts appear to have retained just ideas of the holy Eucharist[l]. But before the end of the ninth century, the eastern innovations, introduced by Anastasius and Damascen, and established by the Nicene Council, spread wide and far, both among Greeks and Latins. When it was once resolved that the consecrated elements should be no longer signs or figures at all, but the very body and blood of Christ, the symbolical language of Scripture and Fathers became neglected, and in a while forgotten; and the old notion of a sacrament, as importing a sign and a thing signified, wore off apace: and now all the care was, how to make out that very body and blood, by some subtile evasions or newly devised theories. Many are the wanderings of human invention, after men have once departed from the right way; as sufficiently appeared from the great variety of systems soon set up[m], instead of the only ancient and true system: and they were all but as so many different modifications of one and the same error, committed in sinking the idea of symbolical grants, and thereupon confounding figure and verity, exalting signs into things signified. But let us inquire more particularly what ways were taken, or could be taken, to make it competently appear, that the elements once consecrated are no signs, but the very body and blood of Christ. They are reducible perhaps to

English-Saxon Church two hundred years later, as appears by Aelfric. 'This mystery is a pledge and a figure: Christ's body is truth itself: this pledge we do hold mystically, until we come to the truth itself, and then there is an end of the pledge.' Sax. Hom. on Easter-day, pp. 7, 8.]

[l] [Yet Paulus Diaconus (who died in 801) is an exception, in what he says in his Life of Gregory. And one may reasonably judge that transubstantiation was then first creeping in, by their feigning of miracles to support the novelty.]

[m] [Vid. Guitmundus, de Verit. Euchar. l. 1. pp. 441, 442. Bibl. PP. tom. xviii. l. 3. p. 460. Algerus, tom. xxi. p. 351.]

five, as follows: 1. Either the elements must literally become the same personal body. 2. Or they must literally contain or inclose the same personal body. 3. Or they must literally become another personal body. 4. Or they must literally contain another personal body. 5. Or they must literally be or contain a true and proper body of Christ, distinct and different from a personal body.

1. As to the first, it was undoubtedly the thing aimed at by the first innovators; namely, by Anastasius, and Damascen, and the Nicene Fathers. And they endeavoured to make it out in the way of augmentation, as has been related, joining the new-made body here to the personal body above, so as to make one personal body of both. Another shorter way of coming at the point was that of transubstantiation, which crept in later, and which the Latins generally fell into; for relief, as it seems, to wearied minds, fluctuating in uncertainties, and not knowing how or where to rest.

2. As to the second way, which has been called consubstantiation, some think that Paschasius Radbert (about A. D. 831) took into it[n]: others conceive that it came in later[o].

3. As to the third way, some have imagined that our Lord's Divinity becomes personally united with the elements, as well as with his own natural body, having in that sense two personal bodies. This conceit has sometimes gone under the name of assumption[p], as it imports the Deity's assuming the elements into a personal union; and sometimes it has been called impanation[q], a name following the analogy of the word incarnation.

[n] Cosin. Histor. Transubstant. p. 86. Cp. Albertinus, p. 922. But others interpret him of transubstantiation. See Claude, part ii. p. 198, &c.

[o] Hospinian, Histor. Rei Sacram. [part ii. p. 6. about A.D. 1060.]

[p] N.B. Assumption has been also a common name for Damascen's hypothesis, wherein it is supposed that the Divinity assumes the elements into a personal union, but by the medium of the natural and personal body. Vid. Pfaffius de Consecrat. p. 450. Buddaeus, Miscell. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 80. ['Ad hanc ipsis fanaticam credulitatem praecivere veterum patrum scripta non bene intellecta, et recentiorum de realitate et praesentia corporis Christi dogma.

'Ex his duobus monstris tertium composuerunt de ista hypostatica unitate panis et divinitatis: quasi divinitas assumpto pane eum faceret corpus Christi, non mutata tamen nec destructa panis substantia.' Salmas. p. 416.]

[q] [A.D. 1070, circiter. Sic Guitmundus: 'Quae insania est, ut Christum,

Rupertus Tuitiensis (about A. D. 1111) has been believed to espouse this notion[r]; and Odo Cameracensis[s], who lived about the same time. It is much the same notion that St. Austin supposes ignorant children might be apt to conceive, in their simplicity, at the first hearing of what is said of the elements, and before they come to know better[t]. So simple were even famous Divines grown in the late and dark ages.

4. As to the fourth way, those who have supposed some spiritual and personal body from above, distinct from the natural, to come upon the elements, and to abide in them and with them, have had some colour for it from two very ancient passages, one of Clemens Alexandrinus, and another of Jerome[u]. But it hath been abundantly shewn, time after time, by learned and able men, that that ancient distinction ought not to be understood of two personal bodies of Christ, but of two distinct views or con-

ut ita dixerim, sua autoritate impanent et invinent? Christum incarnari humanae redemptionis ratio exposcebat: at impanari vel invinari Christum nulla expetit ratio.' Bibl. PP. tom. xviii. p. 461. Unde nova haec companatio? Ibid. p. 461. lib. iii. conf. p. 464. 1130. Algerus, p. 251. tom. xxi. Bibl. PP. p. 260.]

[r] Vid. Hospinian. p. 7. Albertinus, pp. 959, 960. Pfaffius de Consecrat. Euch. pp. 449, 450. Buddaeus, Miscellan. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 80.

[s] 'Fac ergo Domine, nostram oblationem adscriptam, ut pretiosum corpus Christi fiat, Verbo Dei adunata, et in unitate personae conjuncta.' Odo. Cameracens. in Sacr. Can. Exposit. Bibl. PP. tom. vi. p. 360. [Paris. tom. xii. Colon. t. xxi. Lugd. p. 221.]

[t] 'Infantes . . . si nunquam discant experimento, vel suo vel aliorum, et nunquam illam speciem rerum videant, nisi inter celebrationes sacramentorum, cum offertur et datur, dicaturque illis authoritate gravissima, cujus corpus et sanguis sit, nihil aliud credent, nisi omnino in illa specie Dominum oculis apparuisse mortalium, et de latere tali percusso liquorem illum omnino fluxisse.' Augustin. de Trin. lib. iii. c. 10. p. 803. Conf. Albertin. pp. 648, 649.

[u] Διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα Κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικόν, ᾧ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν, τοῦτέστιν ᾧ κεχρίσμεθα. Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. ii. c. 2. p. 177. Compare Review, above p. 149.

'Dupliciter vero sanguis Christi, et caro intelligitur: vel spiritualis illa et divina, de qua ipse dixit Caro mea vere est cibus; vel caro et sanguis, quae crucifixa est, et qui militis effusus est lancea.' Hieron. in Ephes. p. 327. Opp. tom. iv. edit. Bened. Cranmer, b. iv. p. 276. ['Quod Sacramentum est Augustino, Irenaeo est res terrena: quod hic res caelestis illi est res sacramenti, sive corpus Christi.—Haec res sacramenti et virtus sacramenti,—etiam veritas sacramenti dicitur, et spiritus, et gratia nempe spiritalis, et corpus Christi, spiritale scilicet.' Salmas. pp. 163, 165. The body considered as corporally present in heaven, is 'corpus naturale et sensibile,' but considered as spiritually present in the Eucharist, is 'corpus spiritale, intelligibile.']

siderations of one and the same natural and personal body[x]. The celebrated Bertram, (that is, Ratramn,) of the ninth century, has been by some supposed to be of the number of those who made two such bodies of Christ. There is some appearance of it, but, I think, appearance only: for upon carefully weighing and considering his real sentiments, it will be found, that he supposed only a sacramental body received orally, and the natural body received spiritually in the Eucharist[y].

5. There is yet a fifth way, which prevailed with many, as high as the ninth century; which was to imagine some kind of union of our Lord's Divinity with the consecrated elements, short of personal, but yet presumed sufficient to denominate them in a true and proper sense (as opposed to symbolical) the Lord's body and blood. Remigius[z], who flourished about the year 890, conceived, that our Lord's Divinity filling the natural body and the mystical, viz. the Church, and the consecrated elements, made all the three to become one body of Christ. It is observable, that he admits of but one of the three to be Christ's body in the personal sense: but having a confuse notion of some remote union of each with the Logos, which was common to them all, he therefore called each of them singly a true body of Christ, and all

[x] Beza de Coena Domini, p. 93. Jewel's Answer to Harding, art. 5. pp. 248, 249. Albertinus, pp. 315, 395. Rivet in Consult. de Relig. p. 26. Chamier, tom. iv. p. 695. Spalatensis, lib. v. c. 6. p. 103.

[y] Bertram de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, pp. 16, 24, 36, 40, 96, 100, 114, 116. edit. Anglo-Latin. Lond. A.D. 1686.

[z] 'Caro quam Verbum Dei Patris assumpsit in utero Virginali, in unitate suae personae, et panis qui consecratur in Ecclesia, unum corpus Christi sunt. Sicut enim illo caro corpus Christi est, ita iste panis transit in corpus Christi; nec sunt duo corpora, sed unum corpus. Divinitatis enim plenitudo quae fuit in illa, replet et istum panem, &c. . . . et sicut ille panis et sanguis in corpus Christi transeunt, ita omnes qui in Ecclesia digne comedunt illud, unum Christi corpus sunt. . . . Tamen illa caro quam assumpsit, et iste panis, omnisque Ecclesia non faciunt tria corpora Christi, sed unum corpus.' Remig. Antissiodorensis (alias Haymo) in 1 Cor. x. p. 132. [Conf. ejusdem Remigii Exposit. Missae, Bibl. PP. tom. xvi. p. 957. sive de celebratione missae.]

'Sicut caro Christi quam assumpsit in utero Virginali, verum corpus ejus est, et pro nostra salute occisum, ita panis quem Christus tradidit discipulis suis . . . et quem quotidie consecrant sacerdotes in Ecclesia, cum virtute Divinitatis quae illum replet panem, verum corpus Christi est; nec sunt duo corpora illa caro quam assumpsit, et iste panis, sed unum verum corpus faciunt Christi.' Id. in 1 Cor. xi. p. 137. Cp. Albertin. p. 938.

conjunctly one true body. The like account may be seen in the book De Divinis Officiis [a], falsely ascribed to Alcuinus of the eighth century, written probably in the eleventh century or later. The sum is, that because one of the three is truly Christ's body in a symbolical sense, and the other truly his body in a mystical sense, and the third in a true and proper sense; therefore all the three are severally a true body of Christ, and together one true body. Such were the rovings of men bewildered in their ways, after they had deserted the old paths. It is however worth the observing, that this author was very solicitous to avoid the suspicion of making two true bodies of Christ, which Christian ears could not bear: and further, that he retained so much of the ancient principles, under clouds of confusion, as to suppose the Logos to be the heavenly food of the Eucharist, and he resolved the formal reason of the name of Lord's body into some immediate relation to the person of Christ. I do not find that the third Person's filling the elements with himself, or with his graces, was hitherto supposed the immediate ground or formal reason of their having the name of Christ's body: or had it so been, the element of Baptism, upon the analogy observed by the ancients, would most certainly have had a better title to the name. For the Holy Ghost was supposed more immediately to preside, as it were, in that Sacrament, under the figure of a conjugal union, as before mentioned: and even as low as Damascen we find, that while the grace of the Spirit was said to be joined with the oil and the water, the very Divinity of the second Person was supposed to be joined with the elements of the Eucharist [b].

I am sensible that a great show of authorities has been produced, in order to persuade us, that, according to the ancients, the third Person was presumed to make the elements the body and blood of Christ [c]. But out of twenty-two authorities, seventeen, as I conceive, either must or may be understood of the second Person [d], the Λόγος, often called Spirit: and the five

[a] Pseudo-Alcuinus de Divin. Off. cap. 40. p. 287. ed. Hittorp.

[b] See above, pp. 502, 503.

[c] Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 187–195.

[d] 1. Ignatius. 2. Justin Martyr.

remaining authorities prove only, that the Holy Ghost[e] makes the elements sacraments, or sanctified symbols, or an holy body, fitting them for the uses intended, and preparing the communicants at the same time. The Holy Ghost prepares both the symbols and the guests: but still it is the Logos, the incarnate Logos, who is properly the spiritual food or feast, according to Scripture and all Catholic antiquity; and that not as residing, by his Divinity, in the elements, but as adsistant only, or concomitant; and that to the worthy only[f]. But I pass on.

I have been observing something of the various wanderings and mazes which thoughtful men fell into, after the change of doctrine introduced in the seventh century. For from thence came augmentation, assumption, impanation, composition, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, local presence, and oral manducation of the 'res sacramenti,' inherent virtues, bread-sacrifice[g], bread-worship, and the like; all issuing from the same source, all springing from the same root; namely, from that 'servilis infirmitas,' which St. Austin speaks of, the mistaking signs for things, and figure for verity.

3. Irenaeus. 4. Clemens Alexandrinus. 5. Origen. 6. Cyprian. 7. Athanasius. 8. Julius Firmicus. 9. Nazianzen. 10. Epiphanius. 11. Gregory Nyssen. 12. Ephrem Syrus. See Albertin. 453. 13. Gaudentius. 14. Cyrill. Alex. See Albertin. 454. 15. Gelasius. 16. Theodorite. 17. Pseud-Ambrose. [See Cranmer, p. 356; above, p. 493. Review, above, p. 266, et seqq.]

[e] Cyril. Hierosol., Optatus, Chrysostom, Austin, and Council of Constantinople.

[f] ['Ea igitur communio spiritus et panis, spiritus et vini, quam Patres in his sacramentis fieri dicunt, non in ipso pane fit, neque in ipso calice, sed in corde sumentis per fidem.' Salmasius, p. 429. See below, pp. 517, 518. and compare Pfaffius, pp. 414, 431, 432, 446.

'Ex istis apparet totidem exortas fuisse haereses circa praesentiam corporis Christi in eucharistia quot olim fuere circa Verbi incarnationem in eo mysterio: cum alii *κατ' ἀλλοίωσιν* eam extitisse dicerent, alii *κατὰ μετακίνησιν*, alii *κατὰ περικλασμόν*. Huic postremae par est Lutheranorum sententia.' Salmas. p. 422.

'Non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum Sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.' Augustin. de Trin. l. iii. c. 4.]

[g] ['Ne forte ob hoc censeamur indigni, si non satis discernimus illud, nec intelligimus, mysticum Christi corpus et sanguis quanta polleat dignitate, quantaque praeemineat virtute, et discernatur a corporeo gustu, ut sit praestantius omni sacrificio veteris testamenti.' Paschal. Radbert. c. 2. Opp. p. 1559. Algerus, 268.

'Christi caro est, quae pro mundi vita adhuc hodie offertur.' 555. When bread was once supposed to be literally that body which was sacrificed, it must of course be thought a sacrifice: hence bread-sacrifice.]

The Reformation, as is well known, commenced in the sixteenth century, and then this high subject came to be reconsidered, and to be set in a proper light, upon the foundation of Scripture and antiquity. But disputes arose even among Protestants. For though the later and grosser corruptions of the Latin Church were soon thrown off with general consent, yet some of the older and more refined depravations of the Greeks were not easily distinguished (in those infant days of criticism) from what was truly ancient, but had made too deep an impression upon the minds of many serious persons. The nature of symbolical grants and constructional conveyances was not so well considered as might have been wished. Many understood not what eating could mean, unless it were conceived to be oral and literal: neither could they suddenly bring their minds to comprehend how a thing could be said to be given and received at the supper, without being literally, locally present in the supper, in the very tokens or pledges of the heavenly things there made over to every faithful communicant. As if livery and seisin might not be given and taken by proper instruments: or as if a ring, a book, a crosier, or other tokens of investiture, might not convey lands, honours, dignities, without being inwardly enriched with [h], or outwardly converted into the very things themselves which they so convey. For as any person becomes legally vested in an estate by the delivering and receiving of deeds, though he does not literally take the lands and tenements into

[h] See Review, above, pp. 131, 132. 'Sicut sigillum principis vere est non otiosum, sed efficax, nulla tamen sibi indita virtute, sed authoritate duntaxat principis quasi comitante: sic Sacramenta, quae in signis et signaculis esse negare nullus potest, ... etsi nulla in rebus externis vi indita agant in animas hominum, aut in gratiam quae in iis quaeritur, tamen non desinunt esse instrumenta efficacia, tanquam *σημεῖα καὶ σφραγίδες*.' Chamier, tom. iv. p. 57. [See below, p. 536. 'Quomodo, dicente Bernardo, confertur Canonicatus per dationem libri, Abbatis praefectura per baculum, Episcopatus per annulum: quomodo de consensu contrahentium per traditionem authentici instrumenti confertur haereditas, quomodo etiam ex nummo uno fit arrha, quae valet ad solutionem mille nummorum; sic ex pacto et conventione inter Deum et hominem, ad dignam sacramentorum perceptionem gratia divina confertur, et caelestis haereditatis arrha. Quae est sententia non nostrae duntaxat ecclesiae, sed et primorum Romanensium, tum veterum Halensis, Gandavensis, Bonaventurae, Scoti; tum etiam multorum recentium, Cani, Vasquesii.' Ward, p. 44.]

his hands, nor grasp them in his arms; so may a person, in construction of Divine law, be vested in or possessed of the Lord's body and blood, and whatever depends thereupon, without literally receiving the same into his mouth[i]. The notion is a very plain and easy notion, that one might justly wonder how it came to pass, that even Divines of good note should not hit upon it at first; or if they did, should slight it[k].

Our Divines, as Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, &c. (to do them justice,) understood this matter perfectly well. Neither do I know of any considerable person amongst our early Reformers who missed the right thought: unless perhaps we may except the great Bishop Poynet, in his exile at Strasburg, where he died A.D. 1556. He drew up his Diallacticon abroad, with a truly pious and pacific design, hoping to contribute something towards healing the then reigning differences between Lutherans and Calvinists, upon the subject of the Eucharist. The treatise was not published till after his death[l]: a short preface was

[i] ['His body and blood are by this Sacrament assured to be no less ours than his—He hath made himself all ours. Ours his passions, ours his merits, ours his victory, ours his glory. And therefore he giveth himself and all his in this sacrament wholly up to us.' Archbishop Sandys, Serm. xv. p. 134. See Review, above, p. 126.]

[k] It is marvellous to observe, how from the time of Paschasius Radbert, of the ninth century, down to the sixteenth, almost the whole Latin Church were imposed upon themselves, or imposed upon others, by confounding two very distinct propositions with each other, as if they were the same. [A.D. 890. Ratram opposed transubstantiation. A.D. 1035 circiter, Berengarius began to oppose that doctrine: condemned in several Councils, 1050, 1053, 1055, 1059, 1078, 1079. He died A.D. 1088.] They saw plainly, both in Scripture and Fathers, that the natural body of Christ is the thing signified, and received by the faithful in the Eucharist: that is to say, received with the elements, spiritually received. Had they rested there, all had been right. But by slipping a false consequence, or false comment upon true premises, they inadvertently changed that sound proposition into this very unsound one: that the elements literally are that very natural body, locally present, and orally received by every communicant. They had lost the idea of a symbolical and constructional reception; which requires neither local presence nor corporal contact.

[The Anglo-Saxon Church retained the old distinctions till the close of the 10th century, as appears from Aelfric's Saxon Homily on Easter Day, p. 7. He was Abp. of Cant. 993, and died A.D. 1006.]

[l] 'Diallacticon viri boni et literati, de veritate, natura, atque substantia corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia.' 1557. First edition, Strasburg. 1573. Second edition, Geneva. At the end of Beza's Opuscula, 1576. Third edition. At the end of Harchius, 1688. Fourth edition, London. By Dr. Pelling.

prefixed to it by the editor, supposed to be Sturmius [m]. I shall give a brief account of the author's main principles, using the octavo edition of 1576.

He was a religious admirer of the ancient Fathers: but as their works were not at that time critically distinguished, he was often misled, even in the main lines of his hypothesis, by spurious pieces or passages; quoting several material things under the admired names of Cyprian, Ambrose, and Austin, which belonged not to them, but were some of them as late as the twelfth century. Many passages of Austin and others stand only on the credit of Gratian, an author of the twelfth century. And it is known that the piece De Coena, ascribed to Cyprian, belongs to Arnaldus, who wrote about A.D. 1162. Under these disadvantages, it is the less to be wondered at, if the excellent author did not everywhere hit that ancient truth which he sincerely sought for.

1. In the first place [n], he appears to carry the notion of inherent virtues or graces, as lodged in the elements themselves, much too far [o]. And he seems to make the conjunction of grace and

[m] See the French Supplement to Bayle's Dictionary, in the article 'Poinet.'

[n] ['Invocatio illa Dei et benedictio non illigat Spiritum pani, nec includit; sed panem sanctificat, ut possit ab eo qui fidem habet, et mundus est, digne et cum efficacia, non solum sacramentaliter, sed etiam spiritaliter participari.' Salmas. p. 428.

'Nos non dicimus Sacramenta conferre gratiam per ullam illis inditam aut vim aut qualitatem, sive naturalem sive supernaturalem, quod est gratiam conferre per modum causae physicae: sed dicuntur ex nostrae Ecclesiae sententia,' &c. Ward, Determ. p. 44. See below, p. 536.

'Cum patres haec conjuncta esse asserunt, et Sacramentum a sua virtute minime sejungi dicunt, non intelligunt eum spiritum, sive spiritalem gratiam, pani ipsi inseparabiliter adhaerere, sed in ipso corde ipsius accipientis eam unitatem effici per fidem: quam qui non praestat, is non communicat corpori, sed sacramentum, hoc est, nudum signum accipit, non virtutem sacramenti: signum non rem signi percipit.' Salmasius, 427. See above, p. 513. below, p. 538, and Pfaffius, pp. 414, 431, 432, 446.]

[o] 'Vim vitae signis externis inditam,' p. 53. 'Virtutem [veri corporis] vitalem conjunctam habet,' p. 79. 'Virtus ipsius corporis efficax et vivifica—cum pane et vino conjungitur,' p. 83. 'Intus abditam et latentem naturalem ejusdem corporis proprietatem, hoc est, vivificam virtutem, secum trahat,' p. 83. 'Virtutem veri corporis spiritualem habet,' p. 88. 'Virtus autem interna quae vi Divini Verbi accedit,' p. 118. 'Virtute benedictionis mysticae vim insitam,' p. 119.

element absolute and physical [p]. By which means, he found himself at length involved in insuperable perplexities upon the point of adoration of the elements [q], and the communion of the unworthy [r]: though he endeavoured to get off from both, as handsomely as the thing would bear. Our other more cautious Divines of that time, as Cranmer and Jewel, had no concern with those perplexities, any more than the ancient Fathers had: for they avoided the main principle from which those difficulties arose; yea, and flatly contradicted it [s].

2. The very worthy author appears not to have guarded sufficiently against the notion of two true bodies of Christ, natural above, and spiritual below, in the Eucharist: which is what the mild and moderate Cassander, very tenderly, charged him with; intimating, that he had put the distinction wrong between body and body, (as if there were two true bodies,) instead of distinguishing between the different manner of exhibiting or receiving one and the same natural body [t]. And so far Cassander

[p] 'Si gratiam et virtutem veri corporis cum pane et vino conjungi credamus, nimium elementis tribuere videbimur,' p. 107. 'Divina virtus abesse a signo non potest, qua Sacramentum est,' p. 112. 'Sacramenta, quam diu Sacramenta sint, suam retinere virtutem, nec ab ea posse separari,' p. 114.

[q] Page 107, &c. [r] Page 112.

[s] See Cranmer's Preface, cited in Review, above, p. 165, and compare Review, pp. 83, 254. Bishop Jewel writes thus: 'We are taught, not to seek that grace in the sign, but to assure ourselves by receiving the sign, that it is given us by the thing signified. . . . . It is not the creature of bread or water, but the soul of man that receiveth the grace of God. These corruptible creatures need it not: we have need of God's grace. But this is a phrase of speaking. For the power of God, the grace of God, the presence of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, the gift of God, are not in the water, but in us: and we were not ordained because of the Sacraments; but the Sacraments were made for our sake.' Jewel's Treatise of the Sacraments, p. 263. fol. ed. Compare Def. of Apol. pp. 208, 238. [Compare Cranmer, pp. 34, 56, 58, 74, 141, 172, 192, 208, 211, 212, 327, 413.]

[t] 'Quae de duplici Christi corpore (Bertramum secutus) erudite disserit, facile aliquos offendat, quibus ex verbis Christi persuasum est, et quidem vere, non aliud corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, quam quod a Christo pro fidelium salute in mortem traditum fuit. Quamvis autem hic distinctione aliqua opus sit, malim tamen illam ad modum praesentiae et exhibitionis quam ad ipsam rem subjectam, hoc est, corpus Christi, adhiberi. Commodius itaque, et ad docendum accommodatius, et Christi instituto convenientius, et ad conciliationem aptius dici videtur, ipsum Christi corpus pro nobis traditum, etiam in Eucharistia fidelibus tradi; adhibita Augustini distinctione: "Ipsum quidem, et non ipsum; ipsum invisibiliter, et non ipsum visibiliter,"' &c. Cassander, Epist. p. 1084. Cp.

judged very rightly, and conformably to the ancients: only as he chose to distinguish between a visible and invisible manner, he should rather have expressed it in the terms of literal and spiritual; which is the true distinction.

Bishop Cosin [u], speaking of Bishop Poynet, represents him (if there be not some error of the press) as making that very distinction which Cassander wished he had made, or which he suggested, by way of correction, as preferable to Poynet's. I say, Bishop Cosin represents Poynet as doing the very thing which Cassander required, and mostly in Cassander's own words, without naming him. Yet it is plain enough, that that distinction which Cosin ascribes to Poynet was not his, but Cassander's: wherefore I suspect some error of the press or of the editor, (as might easily happen in a posthumous piece,) and that Cosin really wrote 'malim,' not 'maluit,' making Cassander's censure his own. But of this let the considerate readers of both judge, as they see cause. Certain however it is, that Bishop Cosin (with all our other learned and judicious Divines) was zealous against the notion of two true bodies of Christ [x], and very strongly asserted, yea, and often inculcated, in that small treatise, where he had not much room to spare, that the natural body is the thing signified, the thing spiritually given and received by the faithful in the Eucharist. He was well aware, how much depended upon that momentous principle [y]; as well because it was the safe, the only clue to lead serious Christians through all the labyrinths of contending parties, as also because it was fixing

Rivet. Animadv. ad Consult. p. 30. Apologet. p. 102. [Discuss. Dialysis, p. 78.] Grotii Opp. tom. iii. 621, 643, 660, 668. ['Here you grant that Christ's body was made of bread. And then it must follow, that either Christ had two bodies (the one made of flesh of the Virgin Mary, the other of bread,) or else that the selfsame body was made of two diverse matters, and at diverse and sondry times.' Cranmer, 297.]

[u] 'Licet discrimen ipse cum Patribus agnoscat inter corpus Christi formam humani corporis naturalem habens, et quod in Sacramento est corpus mysticum, maluit tamen discrimen illud ad modum praesentiae et exhibitionis, quàm ad ipsam rem subjectam, hoc est, Christi corpus verum, accommodari; quum certissimum sit, non aliud corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari nisi quod a Christo pro fidelium salute in mortem traditum fuit.' Cosin. Hist. Transubst. p. 10.

[x] [See Cranmer, p. 267.]

[y] [See Review, above, pp. 149, 152, 164, 168, 170–173.]

the economy of man's salvation upon its true and firm basis, which is this: that in the Sacraments we are made and continued members of Christ's body, of his flesh, and of his bones [z]. Our union with the Deity rests entirely in our mystical union with our Lord's humanity, which is personally united with his Divine nature, which is essentially united with God the Father, the head and fountain of all. So stands the economy; which shews the high importance of the principle before mentioned. And it is well that Romanists, and Lutherans, and Greeks also, even the whole East and West, have preserved it, and yet preserve it: though some of them have miserably corrupted it by the wood, hay, and stubble, which they have built upon it; namely, by a local presence, a literal exhibition, and an oral manducation, with other the like novel additions or defalcations. But I return.

Twenty years after Poynet, a very learned physician, a German, building upon the same principles, and being much more sanguine and self-confident, pursued them to far greater lengths in two several treatises [a], bearing different running titles [b]. His name was Harchius. It was a vast undertaking for that time. He set himself at once to oppose Romanists, Lutherans, and Calvinists, (three sects, as he called them [c],) condemning them all as guilty of great errors in the article of the Eucharist, and proposing a fourth system, wherein they should all unite. He boasted highly of the Fathers, as full and clear on his side [d]: he

[z] Ephes. v. 30.

[a] 'De Eucharistiae Mysterio, Dignitate, et Usu: ex unanimi primitivae Ecclesiae Consensu, ad omnium eorum qui Christi Nomen profitentur sedandas Controversias.' Libri tres. 4to. Jodoco Harchio, Montense Medico, autore. Wormatiae. 1573.

'Orthodoxorum Patrum... Fides de Eucharistia et Sacrificio universali Ecclesiae: ad Pontificiorum et Evangelicorum cognoscendas, dirimendasque Controversias, pro Christi Gloria, et Ecclesiarum Pace. Per Jodocum Harchium, Montensem Medicum.' A.D. 1576. 8vo.

[b] The running title of the first: 'Concordia de Coena.'

The running title of the second: 'Patrum Consensus de Eucharistia.'

N.B. Hospinian says, this last was printed A.D. 1577. Hospin. Histor. Sacram. part ii. p. 354. Which may be true: for I take the date 1576, not from the title-page, (which has no date,) but from the end of the preface, written in 1576.

[c] Harch. Patr. Consens. pp. 183, 230.

[d] Ibid. idem, pp. 77, 127, 129, 270, 278.

filled his two books with quotations of that kind: some genuine and some spurious, some ancient and some middle-aged, some Greek and some Latin; many of them misconstrued, more misapplied, but all made to serve the system [e] which he had before formed in his mind [f]. As the attempt was considerable in its way, and commendable for its good meaning; and as it may be of use to know what the system was, and how received, and how confuted, (for confuted it was by a very able hand,) I shall here take the pains to draw out the chief lines of it, and next to exhibit a brief summary of the answer then made to it.

1. He pleads much for an invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Communion Offices [g]; and he speaks often of some illapse either of the second or third Person upon the elements, or else of some virtue of life, some spiritual and eternal gift, sent down from above, upon the consecrated bread and wine [h].

2. He asserts a spiritual and marvellous change thereby made in the elements, but not destroying either their substance or their figure: a change of qualities, and a melioration, as it were, of the substance itself, by the powerful operation of the Holy Ghost and the supervening of the Logos [i]: on account of which change, he talks frequently of the elements as passing into the virtue of Christ's body and blood [k]. Sometimes he calls it passing into the flesh of Christ, or substance of his body: but then he interprets it to mean, not the personal body or substance, but another

[e] A brief summary of his system, in his own words, is as here follows: 'Panis Eucharistiae' est corpus quoddam sanctum, consecratione sacerdotum factum divinum; existens veluti imago, repraesentatio, seu sacramentum proprii et animati corporis Christi quod in caelo est; impletum a Christo Spiritu Sancto et Verbo: ut offeratur (mystice) Deo Patri, per ministerium sacerdotum; deinde ut sumatur ab omnibus fidelibus, &c. . . . in fide et charitate, ore et corde, ad remissionem peccatorum . . . in spem resurrectionis et vitae aeternae, simul et ad memoriam passionis Christi, &c. Haec definitio vera est et catholica, et a nobis in hoc libro probanda.' Harch. Patr. Consens. p. 93. cp. pp. 68, 79.

[f] ['Patrum multitudine putavit Harchius suum illud commentum aperte confirmari; illis certe non dissimilis quibus si specillis vindicibus utantur viridia omnia apparent.' Beza, 182. fol. edit.]

[g] Harch. Patr. Consens. pp. 25, 96, 98, 100. Concord. p. 146.

[h] Ibid. Concord. pp. 14, 45, 49, 79, 92. Patr. Consens. pp. 56, 115, 151, 157, 168.

[i] Ibid. idem, pp. 30, &c. 75, 82, 83, 86, 146. Patr. Consens. pp. 54, 69, 100, 157, 185.

[k] Ibid. idem, pp. 32, 35, 39, 45, 47, 53, 74, 79, 105.

very like it, or near akin to it in virtue; which he denominates a spiritual body, to distinguish it from the natural and personal body [l].

3. He makes this pretended spiritual body sometimes the body of the Divine Spirit, meaning Christ's own Divine Hypostasis [m]; sometimes, the body of the Word and Spirit together [n]; and sometimes of the Divine essence, or whole Trinity [o].

4. But as he could not admit of a personal union [p] between the Deity and the bread-body, without calling it Christ, and Lord, and God, he was content to call it a creature, but a most noble creature [q]; an image of the natural body, but not full and adequate; extremely like it in power and energy, but not perfectly equal [r]: a true, and holy, and Divine, but inanimate figure, while full of the Word, and of the Spirit, and of grace, and of life [s].

5. He supposed two true bodies of Christ; one in heaven above, another in the Eucharist below: one natural, and eaten by contemplation and faith at all times; the other spiritual, and eaten in the Eucharist both with mind and with mouth [t]. He conceived them to be so nearly the same thing, that they might be reckoned as one flesh, but yet considering that there was some inequality, he rather chose to make them two [u].

6. He maintained an infusion of the Divine essence [x], or of Christ [y], or of some virtue of Christ's flesh [z], into the elements:

[l] Harch. Concord. pp. 33, 35, 39, 45, 53, 74, 105. Patr. Consens. p. 69.

[m] Ibid. idem, pp. 15, 16. Patr. Consens. pp. 28, 42, 47, 69.

[n] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 29, 42, 46, 48, 53, 69, 98, 114, 128, 180.

[o] Ibid. Concord. pp. 31, 48, 70, 74. Patr. Consens. pp. 91, 167, 172, 182, 183.

[p] ['Dat ergo nobis Christus in hoc Sacramento duplicem spiritum suum, existens verus Elias. In pane quidem spiritum proprium verbum ipsum et Dei sapientiam: in vino spiritum qui a Patre procedit et Filio: in utroque vero essentiam totius beatae Trinitatis.' Harch. p. 182. Patr. Consens.]

[q] Ibid. idem, pp. 36, 37, 38, 75, 76, 82, 83.

[r] Ibid. idem, pp. 36, 38, 53, 54, 65, 94, 95. Patr. Consens. pp. 68, 79, 91, 117, 250.

[s] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 68, 76, 85, 90, 91, 92, 93, 112, 131, 147.

[t] Ibid. Concord. pp. 27, 55, 70, 81.

[u] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 215, 216.

[x] Ibid. Concord. pp. 31, 48, 70, 74. Patr. Consens. pp. 74, 76.

[y] Ibid. Concord. pp. 28, 31, 39, 48. Patr. Consens. pp. 74, 77, 225.

[z] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 128, 182, 209, 215.

an inhabitation [a] also, and union [b], and mixture [c] with the same.

7. He once supposed, that the spiritual body in the Eucharist is not so fully or perfectly Christ's body as every good Christian is [d]; but he appears to have changed his mind afterwards, upon a supposal that the fulness of the Godhead resides in the elements, and not ordinarily in good men [e].

8. He supposed the spiritual body to be the vicarious substitute of the natural; not equal in power or virtue, but approximate [f].

9. The spiritual body, not being hypostatically united with the Divinity [g], has no title in his scheme (as he supposed) to formal adoration; but must be reverenced only, or highly venerated [h].

10. He supposed the elements to contain within them the grace of Christ's body, the nature of the word and Spirit, and the essential powers of Christ's body in a permanent way, abiding as long as the elements may serve for food [i].

11. He imagined brutes, upon devouring the elements, to devour them only: but unworthy communicants are supposed to receive the Deity besides, but as a judge and an avenger; as a burning coal, or a consuming fire, not to save, but to destroy them [k].

12. He maintained an oral manducation (as of course he must) of the eternal Word, of the Divine substance, and of essential grace [l].

13. As to the sacrifice, he was reasonably modest and cautious in his first piece. He lashed the Romanists on that head, all the way, and blamed some Protestants, but with tenderness [m],

[a] Harch. Concord. pp. 56, 57, 63, 68, 74. Patr. Consens. pp. 50, 91.

[b] Ibid. idem. pp. 15, 57, 71. Patr. Consens. pp. 46, 48, 50, 58, 68, 70, 71, 91, 121.

[c] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 28, 126, 131, 134, 181, 193, 204.

[d] Ibid. Concord. pp. 25, 48, 60, 64.

[e] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 91, 154.

[f] Ibid. idem, pp. 85, 112, 173, 174, 176.

[g] Ibid. Concord. pp. 37, 63, 68, 86, 87, 105. Patr. Consens. pp. 54, 91, 126, 173.

[h] Ibid. idem, pp. 59, 60, 106, Patr. Consens. pp. 52, 53, 54, 65, 130, 213, 217, 262.

[i] Ibid. idem, p. 89. Patr. Consens. pp. 64, 83, 102, 175, 209, 213, 228.

[k] Ibid. idem, pp. 41, 56, 71, 72, 87, 88. Patr. Consens. pp. 61, 139, 140, 141, 175, 212.

[l] Ibid. idem, p. 15. Patr. Consens. pp. 82, 93, 138, 151, 154, 174, 201, 212.

[m] 'Ne quis putet in posterum in Coena Domini nullum esse sacrificium: quod ab Evangelicis aliquot doleo nimis impudenter negatum, aut omissum, neque in catechismis

not denying them or others their just commendations [n]. He speaks handsomely of the first English Liturgy, as coming very near to the primitive, and particularly admires their form of consecration, beseeching God to sanctify the gifts with his Holy Spirit and Word [o]. He insisted much upon self-sacrifice, and the sacrifice of alms, and the memorial of our Lord's passion [p]. He expressed some contempt of a bread-sacrifice, a sacrifice of signs and shadows [q]. Had he said, signs and shadows of a sacrifice, rather than sacrifice of signs, he had said better. However, he observed, that a sacrifice of bread and wine is never mentioned in Scripture, no, nor in the Fathers; except in such a qualified sense as Irenaeus speaks of [r]. He had a particular fancy, that the elements should first be made food of, and then sacrificed from within: for so he hoped to avoid all extrinsic sacrifice, (condemned by Scripture,) and to account the better for the order of the words of institution [s]. Besides, it would suit the more aptly with another fancy of his, viz. that though the elements were the body of the Logos before manducation, yet they were not the body of Christ, God-man, till eaten and converted into human flesh [t].

14. In his second treatise he altered his notion of the sacrifice more ways than one: whether disgusted with the Protestants for slighting his kind offices, or whether further instructed, it is certain, that he came much nearer to the Popish sacrifice, and brought severer charges than before, both against Lutherans and Calvinists, as casting off the visible sacrifice of the Church [u].

explicatum.' Harch. Concord. p. 132.

[n] 'Legite, O pontificii, Liturgiam Justini, et putabitis institutam fuisse a Calvino. Legite et eam quae fertur Jacobi, et quid, precor, differt ab ea quam instituit Lutherus?' Ibid. p. 132.

[o] Harch. Concord. pp. 145, 146.

[p] Ibid. idem, pp. 52, 120, 131, 132, 133, 138, 139, 143, 147, 148, 158, 161, 167, 168, 171, 176.

[q] Ibid. idem, pp. 120, 139, 143, 147, 155, 157, 158.

[r] 'De panis et vini hostia nusquam leges in Scripturis, imo neque in Patribus; nisi ea ratione offeramus panem et ejusmodi visibilia, quae Irenaeus vocat creaturas, ut non appareamus in conspectu Dei aut vacui aut ingrati.' Harch. Concord. p. 171.

[s] Ibid. idem, pp. 171, 174, 175.

[t] 'Etiamsi panis Eucharistiae sit virtute caro Christi, et realiter corpus Verbi ante manducationem, tamen ut fiat actu vera caro, debet prius manducari, et nutritionis lege in carnis formam converti.' Harch. Concord. p. 80.

[u] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 38, 39, 40, 234, 270, &c. 281, 282, 285.

He forgot his former speculations about the sacrifice following the manducation; for now he made it go before[x]. And whereas formerly he had disowned any propitiatory sacrifice[y], content with gratulatory, after the Protestant way, he now made it properly propitiatory, inventing a colour for it, viz. that Christ himself consecrates by the minister, fills the elements with the Logos and Spirit, is present with them, and offered by himself in them and with them[z].

15. As to our Lord's own sacrifice in the original Eucharist, he supposed him to have offered up that spiritual body there made, that compound body of spirit and element: or else perhaps he offered up his own natural body to the Father, as it were in effigy, under the symbols of bread and wine[a].

16. His construction of the words of institution may be worth the noting as a particularity. He interprets the words, 'This is my body given for you,' as if our Lord had said, 'This is my spiritual body, given me by my Father, for your consolation and conservation[b].' A construction scarce tolerable, if there had

[x] Harch. Patr. Consens. pp. 79, 274, 275.

[y] Ibid. Concord. pp. 132, 143, 161.

[z] Ibid. idem, pp. 240, 263. 'In hoc pane praesens et oblatus,' p. 264. 'Hostia offertur, et grata est Patri, et simul propitiatoria: non ex se, sed oblata per Christum,' p. 300.

[Yet he blames the Papists in strong terms, p. 232 of the same treatise, of 1576. 'Veritatem ipsam pro imagine praetendunt et signum adorant simpliciter pro signato. Et cum corpus Christi (quod est ecclesia per eucharistiae panem figurata) debuissent et commendasse et obtulisse Deo patri, per Christum, ipsum Christum Deo patri commendant, et eum pro proprio et novo Ecclesiae sacrificio, se in manibus tenere, hic in terra vere carneum, cruentum, osseumque, et ore comedere persuadent: parum memores illius Origenis in Leviticum dicentis: jejunans debes adire pontificem Christum, qui utique non in terra quaerendus est, sed in caelo, et per ipsum debes offerre Deo hostiam.' Harch. Patr. Consens. p. 232.

'Christus spiritualis offertur mente et manu re vera: at Christus homo carneus et animatus offertur sola mente, per ipsius symbola, panem et vinum.' p. 240.

'Quemve non reddet Deo Patri propitium unigenitus Dei Filius in hoc pane praesens et oblatus?' p. 264.]

[a] 'Christus in pane et vino accipiens, ut homo, a Patre corpus et sanguinem, Verbi scilicet aeterni et Spiritus, obtulit illa eadem Deo Patri ad gratiarum actionem, agnoscens beneficium: vel in pane et vino obtulit, tanquam in symbolis, corpus suum proprium, sequenti die crucifigendum.' Harch. Patr. Consens. pp. 273, 274.

[b] 'Accipite hoc meum corpus, Divini mei Spiritus, quod mihi datur pro vobis a Patre meo, ad vestram consolationem, justificationem, vivificationem, conservationem.' Harch. Patr. Consens. p. 28. cp. p. 29.

not been worse invented for the same words, to serve the like purposes.

I beg pardon, if I have been tedious in recounting the rovings of that learned gentleman; which may have their use, and which were not so much owing to the weakness of the writer, (for I much question whether any one else could have performed better in that way,) as to the weakness of the principle which he had the misfortune to set out with. Whoever else should take in hand to enrich the elements, either with what belongs to us, or with what belongs to God only, could not reasonably expect to succeed any better than that ingenious writer did. He is to be commended however for adhering to the sacrifice of the cross[c], and for allowing, that the faithful partake of Christ's body 'extra coenam[d],' and that the ancient Patriarchs feasted upon the same spiritual food that we do now[e]. In other points where he judged ill, he appears to have intended well: for he certainly had a warm zeal for God, loved religion, (or what he esteemed such,) and had firmness enough to submit to a kind of voluntary exile for it; as he has left upon record[f].

What the Protestants, in general, thought of his first performance, and how coldly they received his reconciling scheme[g], he has himself declared in his preface to the second. They were offended, it seems, with him, for mistaking his talents, and meddling out of his sphere; they approved not of his interposing, without judgment, in theological debates, and admonished him to return to the business of his own profession. The Ro-

[c] Harch. Concord. p. 133.

[d] Ibid. idem, pp. 31, 80, 82, 91. Patr. Consens. pp. 142, 228, 229.

[e] Ibid. Patr. Consens. pp. 200, 201, 202.

[f] Harch. Concord. in dedicatione. Mention also is made of a piece of his, printed in 1573, with this title: 'De Causis Haeresis, proque ejus Exilio, et Concordia Controversiarum in Religione, Haereticorum, Pontificiorum, et Poenitentium, Oratio ad Deum Patrem.' Gesner, Epit. p. 515. This I have at second hand from Mr. Bayle, in the French Supplement to his Dictionary, in the article 'Harchius.'

[g] 'Conabar dissentientes inter se Evangelicos appellatos, (Lutheranos inquam,) et Calvinistas, sive Zuinglianos, conciliare. . . . Sed tantum abest ut ex meis laboribus ullam reportarim gratiam, ut ambobus in sua opinione licet dissimillima haerentibus, ambo me veluti risui et contemptui habentes, ad medicae meae professionis arenam indignabundi relegarint.' Harch. Patr. Consens. in praefat.

manists were either silent, or more favourable in their censures, so far as appears: and he was suspected, by some of the Lutheran way, to incline more to the Popish than to the Protestant interests [h]. He was very impatient for some answer, thinking it a tribute of respect due to himself or to the subject: but he lived not to see any. Beza was preparing one [i], which appeared at length in the year 1580, some time after Harchius's decease. Beza had been dilatory in that matter, under a serious persuasion that such remote and fanciful speculations might best be left to die of themselves. But being at last overruled by friends, he submitted to undertake the work; as he tells us himself [k]. He complains frequently of the author's laboured obscurity, and of the difficulty of ascertaining his true and full meaning [l]. But to prevent any suspicion of unfairness, and to enable the readers to judge for themselves, he collected a competent number of passages out of Harchius's first treatise, and prefixed them to his own, filling more than forty pages with them.

After these preliminaries, he fell directly upon the leading error of the whole system: which was the making the elements receptacles either of the eternal Word or Spirit, or of some Divine power or grace, supposed to be infused into them, inherent in them, intrinsic to them, and permanent with them. He calls it a most grievous error, full of impiety [m]: a notion altogether unscriptural and absurd [n]; yea, and wilder than either consub-

[h] 'Quomodo pontificii me exceperint, vix possum conjecturis assequi, contra quos tamen potissimum omnia argumentorum meorum tela dirigebantur. . . Verum quomodocunque in ea re mecum sentiant aut dissentiant pontificii, relatione tamen postmodum accepi, me potius pontificium quam Evangelicum, ab Evangelicis aliquot esse judicatum.' Harch. ibid.

[i] 'De Coena Domini, adversus Jodoci Harchii Montensis Dogmata, Theodori Bezae Responsio.' Genevae. 1580. pages 8vo. 160. Reprinted in folio, among the Tractatus Theologici, (two volumes,) A.D. 1582. Genevae. From p. 148 to p. 186.

[k] Beza contr. Harch. p. 4. 8vo. ed. alias p. 148. fol. ed.

[l] Ibid. pp. 5, 49, 60, 147, 148. edit. prima.

[m] 'Teterrimum, et plane cum manifesta impietate conjunctum errorem,' p. 52. 'Nego igitur et pernego Deitatem, aut vim ullam Divinam in ipsa signa infundi: et impium esse hoc dogma rursum dico, eo sensu quo loquitur et scribit Harchius; non quo locuti sunt Patres, quorum sententiam penitus depravat.' Beza, p. 71.

[n] Beza, p. 66.

stantiation or transubstantiation, which it aimed to correct[o]. He proceeds to confute it at large, in a strong, masterly way, worthy of his great abilities. I shall endeavour to give you a taste of his performance, in a few particulars; though it must be a great disadvantage to it, to appear as it were in miniature, when the whole is so close and concise: but it is necessary, in a manner, to give some kind of summary view of it.

1. He observes, that the system proposed, under colour of magnifying the signs one way, really lessened and depreciated them another way, as making them bare memorials of what they ought spiritually to exhibit, namely, of the natural body, being in that respect made mere signs, (as any picture might be[p],) rather than exhibitive signs. And though he endeavoured, another way, to give more honour to the signs than really belonged to them, yet he destroyed the very nature of signs by doing it, and made quite another thing of them, viz. receptacles of the Divinity, not exhibitive signs or symbols of the humanity[q]: which, in effect, was excluding the thing signified out of the Sacrament, and seeking salvation independently on Christ's humanity[r]; thereby subverting the economy of man's redemption, which stands in our mystical union with the human nature of Christ[s].

2. Beza observes further, at large, that it is manifestly wrong to interpret 'body given for you,' and 'blood shed,' of anything but

[o] 'Harchius magis etiam ineptam sententiam tuetur: qui ut corporis naturalis localem praesentiam excludat, Deitatem ipsius Verbi ex carne assumpta in panem illapsam, velit intra ipsum panem habitare, adeoque ipsi re ipsa uniri et permisceri,' pp. 66, 67.

[p] 'Docemus Sacramentorum significationem, divinitus institutam, neque nudam esse, qualis est pictarum imaginum et aliorum ejusmodi vulgarium signorum, sed cum ipsa rerum significatarum praebitione conjunctam.' Beza, p. 50.

'Nimium profecto, parce et jejune de isto signorum genere loquitur, cum ea *μνημόσυνα* tantum vocat, quod quam pictis imaginibus convenit.' Beza, p. 51.

[q] 'Quamvis enim postea plus etiam illis quam nos tribuere videatur, nedum ut illa extenuet: si quis tamen rem totam propius inspiciat, comperiet omnem signorum rationem ab ipso aboleri: ut qui panem illum et vinum illud, non corporis illius pro nobis traditi, et sanguinis illius pro nobis effusi signa, sed ipsius essentialis aeterni Filii Dei conceptacula esse contendat.' Beza, p. 51.

[r] 'Neque enim nunc quaerimus, plus an minus in his vel illis detur, sed an idem detur, id est, illa ipsa Christi humanitas. Si hoc negatis, ergo extra Christi humanitatem salutem quaeritis.' Beza, p. 95.

[s] Vid. Beza, pp. 96, 97, 123, &c.

the natural body and blood signified in the Eucharist, and therein also mystically or spiritually given and received [t].

3. Against inherent graces, virtues, powers, &c. he pleads, that to suppose pardon-giving, grace-giving, life-giving powers to be lodged in the elements, is transferring Divine powers from their proper seat, where only they can reside, to things altogether incapable of sustaining them or receiving them: in short, it is communicating to inanimate creatures the incommunicable attributes, properties, or powers of God [u].

4. He enforces his plea by observing, that it is attributing more to the signs, than to the Word of God which makes them signs, and of which as high things are predicated in Scripture, but without any supposal of an inherent or intrinsic power infused into, or lodged in the sounds or syllables [x].

5. He enforces it still further by observing, that it is attributing more to the inanimate elements than could be justly ascribed to the Apostles or others who wrought miracles; not by any inherent or intrinsic powers infused into them, but by the sole power of God extrinsic to them [y].

6. He adds, that it is ascribing more to the bread and wine, the sacramental body, than could be justly ascribed even to our Lord's own natural body considered in itself, or abstracted from his Divinity, the only proper seat or subject of such powers [z]. He dwells upon this topic, as well to guard it from cavil and misconstruction, as to imprint it the deeper on the minds of his readers, being indeed singly sufficient and unanswerable, when rightly understood. For if even a personal union makes not the humanity of Christ life-giving in itself, or so as to become the

[t] Beza, pp. 67, 68, 69, 70, 89, 90.

[u] 'Spiritualia ac divina (cujusmodi incorporatio in Christum, et in eodem collatum justificationis, sanctificationis, et tandem glorificationis, seu vitae aeternae donum) per alium, ut ullo modo efficientem causam, si quis nobis tribui existimet; aut rerum Divinarum prorsus est imperitus, aut plane impius: ut qui quod unius Dei est incommunicabiliter, tam proprium quam ipsa Deitas, ad panem et vinum, res inanimatas, transferat, aut certe cum illis communicet.' Beza, pp. 70, 71: conf. 114, 115, 130–136. [Chamier, Panstrat. vol. iv. pp. 91, 93. Hooker, book v. n. 57, 67.]

[x] Beza, pp. 133, 134, 135.

[y] Ibid. pp. 75, 76, 77, 132, 133, 134.

[z] Ibid. pp. 77, 78, 79, 134.

proper seat or subject of such powers[a], much less can any supposed union of the Logos or of the Spirit with the elements make them the subject or seat of life-giving powers[b]. If it should be pleaded, that a healing virtue went out of Christ's body[c], even that would not reach the case, were it really fact; since healing virtues and grace-giving powers are widely different. But the texts say not that virtue went out of his body, but out of him, or from him: neither is it said, that he felt in his body, but that he knew in himself; knew that a miraculous operation [*δύναμις*] had gone forth from him; which was said, to intimate that a miraculous virtue or power really resided in him, as God-man, but in no man else[d].

I return to Beza.

7. He takes occasion to expose the doctrine of an oral manducation of Christ, or of the Spirit, as palpably absurd[e].

8. He more particularly exposes the notion of the unworthy's receiving the 'res Sacramenti,' the grace of the Sacrament, and not with any benefit, but to certain destruction. A contradiction to all the Scripture phrases in that article, phrases of a kind and gracious import, words of favour, and blessing, and comfort; and such as will no more admit of a destructive meaning, than light, or life, or health, or peace, or immortality can admit of it[f]. Indeed, Christ is offered both to worthy and unworthy in the holy Communion: and to the former, who receive him, he is a life-giver and preserver, while to the latter, who reject him, he is a judge and avenger. Still Christ received is always health,

[a] *Διὰ τὴν ἡνωμένην αὐτῇ ζωὴν, αὐτὴ* [*σὰρξ*] *ζωοποιός.* Theod. Dial. p. 184. 'Caro Christi per se vivifica non est, sed vivificandi vim a Spiritu cui juncta est, id est, a Divinitate mutuatur.' Albertinus, p. 341: cp. 758. [Sadeel, pp. 145, 203, 421.]

[b] N.B. The man Christ (according to the rule of 'communicatio idiomatum,' and after the personal way of speaking) may be said to be God, Life-giver, &c. But as the human nature cannot be said to be the Divine nature, so neither can it be said to be efficiently or properly life-giving. Much less can it be said of the elements, which are not so much as hypostatically united, nor can claim any benefit from the rule of 'communicatio idiomatum,' or from the use of personal phrases.

[c] See Mark v. 30. Luke vi. 19; viii. 46.

[d] 'Cognoscens divinum opus a se patratum.' Vid. Olearius in Matt. pp. 275, 276. Wolfius, Cur. Crit. in loc.

[e] Beza, pp. 86 &c., 100.

[f] Ibid. pp. 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, [172. Rivet. t. ii. 136. Hooker, book v. n. 67. Towerson, 245.]

and life, and blessing to the receiver[g]: and it is Christ rejected, not Christ received, who becomes to every unworthy communicant both a judge and a revenger[h]. This reasoning appears to be just and solid: and it is worth observing, that, after the latest refinements in this article, by the help of a distinction between external and internal eating[i] of the same enriched body[k], yet the difficulty remains as before, and cannot be evaded. For unless the unworthy (who are the external eaters) are supposed externally and orally to eat both the bread and the grace, they cannot be said to eat the body, which is supposed to mean and to consist of both, and is not the enriched body, if either be wanting. All that can be made out, in that way, is, that the unworthy eat one part of the pretended spiritual body, and not the other part; they eat the gross part, viz. the bread, not the finer, viz. the grace: which, in other words, is saying, that they eat not the body; and therefore the distinction so applied destroys itself. The plain truth is, that nothing but the sign is externally eaten, and nothing but the thing signified is eaten internally: therefore to imagine an external or an internal eating both of sign and thing, confounded in one, and called a spiritual body, is joining together incompatible ideas[l]. But I pass on.

[g] 'Omnes quidem manum et os afferentes symbola recipiunt, mens vero vera fide non praedita rem Sacramenti repudiat: ac proinde reus non fit talis quispiam indigne sumpti corporis et sanguinis Domini, (nisi per corpus et sanguinem ipsa illorum symbola metonymia sacramentali intelligas,) sed corporis et sanguinis Domini contempti, et per incredulitatem repudiati..... Usque adeo conjuncta sunt et connexa vita et caro Christi, quoniam caro Filii Dei est, ut neque vitae particeps esse quisquam extra illius carnis, unici vinculi nostrae cum vita colligationis, participationem possit, neque quisquam illius esse particeps, sive in Verbo, sive in Sacramentis, qui ex ea non vivificetur: et qui contrarium statuunt, Christum dividant: de quibus quid statuendum sit, docet Spiritus Sanctus, 1 John iv. 3.' Beza, ibid. p. 103. Cp. Beza contr. Pappum de Unione hypostatica, pp. 138, 139, 140.

[h] 'Christus igitur ipse, tum in Verbo, tum in Sacramentis, eos quidem a quibus sumitur, id est, fideles, vivificat: incredulos autem non receptus, sed repudiatus judicat.' Beza contr. Papp. p. 140.

[l] [The same distinction was observed for the same purpose. G. Paschat. Radbert, p. 1568.]

[k] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 208, 351–356.

[l] ['Duplex est homo, qui comedit, externus et internus: duplex manducatio, qua comeditur, externa et interna: duplex etiam cibus qui comeditur, externus et internus: externus cibus ab externo homine, externa manducatione comeditur: internus ab interno interna manducatione participatur.' Salmasius, p. 426.]

9. Beza takes notice how Harchius's system might lay a foundation for bread-worship, stronger and firmer than even the Popish one does, because of the union or mixture of essential Divinity with the elements, which it introduces and rests upon[m]. He adds, that it would go near to destroy the 'sursum corda,' the lifting up of the heart, so much and so justly celebrated by the ancients. For if the elements really contain such immense treasures, what need have we to look up to the natural body above? Or what have we to do but to look down to those impanated riches, to the elements ennobled with all graces and virtues, and replenished with that very Divinity which makes the humanity so considerable[n]?

10. When Beza came to answer on the head of sacrifice, he appeared to be much concerned at Harchius's unfair and ungenerous dealing, in reviving stale accusations against Protestants, without so much as taking notice of the strong and repeated replies[o]. He avers solemnly, that the reformed had been so far from discarding the eucharistical sacrifice, that they only had most strictly preserved it, or rather retrieved it, fixing it upon its true and ancient basis. Therefore he resented Harchius's misreport, in this article, as a grievous calumny[p] upon the Protestant name, since the Protestants had not rejected all sacrifice, no nor so much as a visible sacrifice in the Eucharist[q].

This was the turn that Beza gave to that matter; and it was the right turn, made use of before by Bucer in 1546. For Bucer was so far from submitting to the injurious charge of discarding the sacrifice, that he retorted that very charge, and justly, upon the accusers themselves: not merely pleading, in behalf of the Protestants against the Romanists, that we have a sacrifice as well as they, but that we only had kept it, and that they had lost it, or however had so lamentably depraved or smothered it,

[m] Beza, pp. 146, 147.

[n] Ibid. p. 147.

[o] Ibid. p. 152.

[p] 'Cum totidem illa constet a nobis diligenter fieri, calumniator in eo deprehendetur, quod sacrificium a nobis sublatum esse dicat.' Beza, p. 153.

[q] 'Quo sensu veteres Coenam Domini sacrificium vocarint, apertissime liquet. Ostendat autem Harchius ecquid tandem istorum in nostris ecclesiis praetermittatur; et tunc a nobis visibile sacrificium abolitum esse clamitet.' Beza, p. 155.

that what remained of it was next to none[r]. This he said, and this he proved, beyond all reasonable contradiction. They must be very little acquainted with those two excellent men, Bucer and Beza, who can suspect that they admitted of no sacrifice but mental or vocal only: for they were firm and constant friends to the Christian sacrifice, rightly understood; to external sacrifice[s], and that principally in the Eucharist, as all the Fathers were. Had but the Protestant Divines, as many as came after them, been as careful and accurate as they were in the stating the main question, and as constant in abiding by it, many intricate disputes which have since risen might have been happily prevented. For, indeed, the great question between the Romanists and us[t], is not whether the Eucharist be a proper, or a visible, or an external sacrifice, but whether it be an extrinsic sacrifice or no; and whether their Eucharist or ours is that Gospel sacrifice

[r] 'Demonstrabo haec ipsa veteris Ecclesiae, et S. Patrum sacrificia nos vere offerre et sacrificare: vestros vero sacrificulos illa cuncta a missis suis omnique sua administratione aut prorsus removisse, aut certe pervertisse, ut auctoritatibus omnibus S. Patrum extremae impietatis convincantur et condemnentur.' Bucer contr. Latom. lib. ii. p. 146.

'Planum faciam in nostris ecclesiis restituta esse cum genera omnia sacrificiorum et oblationum quae offerre vetus Ecclesia solita est . . . deinde ostendam Ecclesiae veteris sacrificia et oblationes per vestros sacrificos aut esse omnino sublata, aut penitus perversa.' Bucer, ibid. p. 246. Cp. pp. 144, 261.

[s] External sacrifice has been owned, not only by Bucer and Beza, but by Hooper, Jewel, Bilson, Fulke, Zanchius, Chrastovius, Mornaeus, Scharpius, Field, Spalatensis, Montague, Lany, Patrick, and many more, who yet admitted none but spiritual sacrifice: neither do I know that any of the old Protestant Divines ever rejected external sacrifice, but in the sense of extrinsic, in which both Scripture and Fathers reject it.

N. B. Extrinsic sacrifice means something 'ab extra,' as a goat, a lamb, a loaf, all extrinsic to us: intrinsic is what proceeds 'ab intus,' from within ourselves; as all our true services do, whether internal and invisible, or external and visible: and therefore if all true services are properly sacrifices, there must of consequence be some visible, external sacrifices. But we ought carefully to note, how the ancient writers used words or phrases. If I mistake not, Lactantius and Austin rejected all visible sacrifice, admitting none but invisible, under the Gospel: but then they meant by invisible, the same with intrinsic; and they call it invisible with respect to its invisible source, as it comes from within.

[t] ['Missa, sicubi a sacerdote celebrari solet, neque sacrificium propitians est, neque laudis aut gratiarum actionis, neque Deo accepta aut probata, sed horribilis et detestabilis res, de qua Servatoris illud verissime dici poterit, Quod celsum est coram hominibus, id abominandum est coram Deo.' Cranmer, Defens. Doctrin. de Sacramento, p. 150.]

which our Lord instituted, and which all antiquity acknowledged. It will be found, upon just inquiry, that our eucharistical sacrifice is the true one, and that their bread-sacrifice (for it is really no better, fiction set aside) is as much a corruption, though not altogether so novel or so dangerous a corruption, as their bread-worship. But I return.

From the time of Beza's answer, Harchius and his system have been very little mentioned: both seem to have been almost buried in oblivion for a hundred and twenty years or more. Only Mr. Bale takes notice [u] of some slight mention made of Harchius, by Rivet, in some letters to Militière, alias Brachet, in the last century. Indeed the Romanists, since that time, have sometimes invidiously and insidiously charged the Protestants as interpreting the words of institution to such a sense as either to make two personal bodies of Christ, or to imagine some other fictitious body, substituted as the 'res sacramenti,' instead of the natural. The Protestants rejected the injurious aspersion with disdain, resenting it as a great reproach, to be so much as suspected of any such thing [x]; but insisting upon it, in the strongest manner, that the words, 'this is my body,' and 'this is my blood,' could not reasonably be interpreted of anything else but the natural body and blood, represented, and sacramentally exhibited, in the holy Communion [y].

From the accounts now laid before you, my Reverend Brethren, I take the liberty to observe, that some late notions of the Eucharist appear to be little else but the remains of that confusion which first began in the decline of the seventh century: and the fundamental error of all lies in the want of a right notion of symbolical language, as before hinted. Hence it is

[u] In the Supplement to Bayle's Dictionary, or in the last French edition, in the article Harchius.

[x] Vid. Chamier, Panstrat. tom. iv. pp. 528, 529.

[y] 'Quaeritur ergo, quid sit corpus meum, sanguis meus. Nos candide, et libere, ac libenter respondemus, κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν interpretandum, cum Hesychio in Levitici xxii. . . . . est igitur corpus illud; id est, solida substantia humanae naturae, quam assumptam in utero Virginis circumtulit in hypostasi sua Verbum; quam cruci affixam, et in sepulchro depositam suscitavit a mortuis. . . . quam denique transtulit in caelos, inde reddendam terris postremo adventu.' Chamier, Panstrat. tom. iv. p. 528.

that signs have been supposed either literally to be, or literally to inclose, the very things signified, viz. the Divine body, or the Divine graces, virtues, or powers. Beza cleared up what concerned the latter with great acumen and force: and the whole question has been more minutely discussed since by several able hands [z]; but more especially by the very acute and learned Chamier, who has in reality exhausted the question, both historically and argumentatively, in his disputes against the Romanists [a].

I may note by the way, that the Romanists, from the time of the Trent Council [b], have commonly maintained some kind of physical efficiency in the outward sacraments, together with inherent graces as infused into the elements: though some of their ablest Divines have scarce known what to make of the Trent doctrine on that head, but have in a manner given up the thing, contending merely for words or names. Cardinal Allen, one of the shrewdest of them, saw the absurdity of the notion, and exposed it: being aware how ridiculous it would be, to imagine any inherent or intrinsic powers to have been infused into clay and spittle, into handkerchiefs and aprons, or into St. Peter's shadow [c]: neither durst Bellarmine afterwards be at all positive on that head [d]. But yet both of them were minded to contrive

[z] Hooker, book v. chap. 57, 60, 67. Gasp. Laurentius, Defens. Sadeelis, p. 382, &c. Rivet. Cathol. Orth. tom. ii. p. 5, &c. Vossius de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia. Le Blanc, Thes. p. 253. Preservative against Popery, vol. ii. tit. 7. p. 32. Albertinus, p. 503. [Davenant, Determ. p. 108. Salmasius, p. 249, &c. Ward, Determ. p. 62. Spalatensis, 910.]

[a] Chamier, Panstrat. tom. iv. pp. 51–96.

[b] 'Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novae legis non continere gratiam quam significant, ... anathema sit.' Concil. Trident. sess. vii. can. 6.

[c] 'Noli putare id Patres dicere, quasi sit aliqua permanens qualitas a Deo infusa Sacramento, aut ejus materiae, cum ea qualitas neque spiritualis, neque corporalis esse possit. Nam si corporalis esset, nihil adjuvaret ad spiritualem effectum magis quam ipsa natura aquae: et spiritualis qualitas non potest inesse in corpore tanquam in subjecto. Sed id volunt, hanc esse virtutem Sacramentorum, ordinari, moveri, applicari, elevari a Deo ad effectum spiritualem..... Christus accipiendo lutum aut salivam, non impressit illis, multo minus umbrae Petri, aliquam qualitatem medicam; sed utendo, ac applicando, elevavit eas, ad quascunque sanitates producendas: cum ipsae qualitates sanativas actu inhaerentes atque stabiles non haberent.' Alanus de Euchar. p. 130. Compare my Review, above, pp. 275, 276.

[d] 'Non esse controversiam de modo quo Sacramenta sunt causae,

some verbal evasion, whereby to make a show of maintaining what in reality they had yielded up. They pretended I know not what Divine movement, raising or enabling the elements to produce the effect: which was somewhat like the subtilty of those who, not knowing how to ascribe thought to matter, as such, either added motion to matter, or had recourse to Divine omnipotence, to salve the hypothesis. Only there is this difference between the two cases, that thought is a communicable attribute, which a creature may have; but a grace-giving power is incommunicable, and can reside only in a Divine Being. Gerard Vossius has well observed[e], that the evasion before mentioned was a mere evasion: and indeed it amounts only to so many unmeaning words, artfully thrown together as a fine-spun covering, to hide the flaws of a false hypothesis. Be the Divine movement what it will, it can never shake God's attributes from his essence, or his incommunicable powers from his nature, so as to transfer or impart them to a foreign subject. God may co-operate with the elements, so as to affect the soul, while they affect the body: but his operations and powers, though assistant or concurrent, are not inherent or intermingled, but are entirely distinct; and are as truly extrinsic to the elements, as the Deity is to the creature. When and where the elements are duly administered and received, God does then and there work the effect, pursuant to his promise and covenant[f]. The elements are the occasional

an physice, &c. . . . . et rursum si physice, an per aliquam qualitatem inhaerentem, an per solam Dei motionem.' Bellarm. lib. ii. cap. 1. p. 30.

[e] 'Commentum hoc de effectu ab actionis vi orto, nec tamen a vi interna ejus, cujus actio est, profecto merum *κρησφύγετον* est, eademque facilitate, qua citra probationem ullam affertur, etiam rejici debet.' Vossius de Sacram. Vi et Efficacia, p. 253. [Cp. Davenant, Determin. 23. pp. 108, 109. Ward, Determ. pp. 62, 44.]

[f] 'Effectum non attingunt proprie, sed operari dicuntur, quia ubi sunt, Deus juxta promissionem suam operatur, et concurrit ad productionem effectus supernaturalis.' Albertinus, p. 503.

'Res ipsa quae unitur nobiscum in conjunctione spirituali, nequaquam cum illis signis unitur: alioqui sacramentalis etiam haec unio [unio pacti] esset dicenda spiritualis; quae ipsa quoque signa vivificaret; et signa ipsa sacramentalia non amplius essent instrumenta, sed ipsa forent causa efficiens et formalis: quod est *ἀθεόλογον*, et naturae Sacramentorum, atque Spiritus Sancti energiae, fideique proprietati omnino repugnans.' Gasp. Laurent. Index. Error. Greg. de Valent. in Opp. Sadeel. p. 382. ['Nos non dicimus

causes, as it were, and he the efficient: this is the whole of that matter.

If what hath been said may be thought sufficient to vindicate the received doctrine of this Sacrament, as a sacrament, then the other notion of it, together with the bread-sacrifice built upon it, must fall of course: and we may reasonably rest contented with what our excellent Church has all along taught us, both of the sacrament and sacrifice: which in truth is no other doctrine but what the New Testament, and the Fathers of the Church from the beginning, and downwards for six whole centuries, have delivered: here fix we, and abide. And that the reasonableness of our so abiding may yet more clearly and more succinctly appear, I beg leave here to throw in a few pertinent considerations, for a kind of recapitulation of what I have before said.

1. Let it be considered what pains have been taken some way or other to enrich and ennoble a bread-sacrifice, in order to make it bear, or to suit it to a Gospel state, and yet none of the ways will answer upon a strict trial; unless we could be content to rest in words which have no consistent or no determined ideas. Shall we fill the elements with Divinity, like as our Lord's personal body is filled[g]? A vain thought! But supposing it were fact, yet shall we sacrifice the Divine essence, or any of the Divine persons? God forbid. Yet Harchius, in his way, was forced to admit of that absurdity, in order to make

sacramenta conferre gratiam per unam illis inditam aut vim aut qualitatem (sive naturalem, sive supernaturalem) quod est gratiam conferre per modum causae physicae: sed dicuntur, ex nostrae Ecclesiae sententia, efficacia gratiae signa, quia divina virtus hisce sacramentis ad producendum gratiae effectum, certo et infallibiliter ex tenore foederis et Christi promissione, assistit, ut viz. rationem habeant causae sine qua non, vel potius causae instrumentalis, generaliter dictae, instrumentum morale vocant.' Sam. Ward, Determ. p. 44.]

[g] The similitudes made use of for magnifying the consecrated elements, (chiefly since the seventh century,) are these five:—

1. As the Λόγος deified, in a manner, the natural body; so, &c.

2. As the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ's body; so, &c.

3. As the Holy Ghost formed the body in the womb; so, &c.

4. As the Holy Ghost inhabited the man Jesus; so, &c.

5. As the burning bush was a shechinah of God; so, &c.

All of them novel, and foreign; and betraying great forgetfulness of symbolical language, or sacramental phrases.

out his pure and unbloody, and propitiatory sacrifice [h]: and so must all they who build upon the same general principles, if they mean to be consistent with themselves.

Or shall we, to avoid the former absurdity, endeavour only to enrich the elements with grace-giving or life-giving powers [i]? That would be sacrificing the Divine attributes, as before, only with the additional absurdity of abstracting them from the essence, and placing them in a creature, an inanimate creature.

Or shall we call it only the sacrificing of grace and pardon, first lodged in the elements, and next transferred from them to us? But how shall we make sense of it [k]: and if we could, how would it answer the purposes intended by it? It is very certain, that good Christians are endowed with infused and inherent graces. Now, supposing that the elements have the same, (which however is a wild supposition,) yet that could only make the elements, so far, equal to every good Christian: and still the good Christian, though equal only in that view, will be as much a nobler sacrifice than the elements, as man, the living image of God, is better than a dead loaf. Why then so much earnestness for a dead sacrifice, (were it really any,) in preference to so many better living ones? Or what sense or consistency can there

[h] Harchius, Patr. Consens. pp. 240, 263, 273, 275, 280, 299, 300.

[i] ['Ea igitur commixtio spiritus et panis quam patres in his sacramentis fieri dicunt, non in ipso pane fit, neque in ipso calice, sed in corde sumentis per fidem.' Salmas. 429. See above, pp. 513, 514. Compare Pfaffius, 414, 431, 432, 446. 'Neither the bread nor the water giveth life—but only the might and power of Christ that is in them: and yet not in them reserved, but in the action and ministration: as is manifest from his (Epiphanius's) words.' Cranmer, p. 327.]

[k] N.B. Whatever the Fathers may be conceived to have, looking at all that way, is either to be understood of what is concurrent with the elements, not inhering in them; or else, it is to be interpreted of the whole sacramental solemnity, in which God bears his part: and then it is no more than saying, that God is in the Sacraments, as he really is, and operates in both, as he really does. It may be justly said, that the abiding virtue of Baptism, (not the inherent virtue of water, which is none,) operates as long as a man lives. See Review, above, p. 216. That is, God applies and continues the graces and privileges of that seal, and his work is sure and lasting. And if God operated with the consecrated elements reserved in the Church, or in private houses, for many days or weeks after; it was not because the elements retained any inherent virtues, but because God is true and constant to his own covenants or ordinances.

be in proclaiming, that such dead sacrifice, and offered by man, is the most sublime and Divine sacrifice that men or angels can offer[l]; especially considering, that the value of the sacrifice can never rise higher than the value of the sacrificer[m]?

Shall we at length say (which appears to be the last refuge) that the sacred elements are the most perfect and consummate representatives of the natural body and blood, answering to the originals as completely, as exemplified copies do to charters, or to letters patents? Such words are easily thrown out: but what sense do they bear, or what Scripture or Fathers have ever used them[n]? Or to what purpose can it be, to make use of swelling and magnificent phrases, without any coherent or determinate ideas! Besides that even the original body and blood do not operate efficiently, as the elements are supposed to do, but meritoriously[o], and that by means of the Divinity which personally resided and resides in them: therefore, unless the elements have the same Divinity personally united with them, they can be no such consummate proxy as hath been pretended. Upon the whole, this account must either at length resolve into a personal union of the elements with the Logos, or amount to nothing. I have endeavoured to turn and try this matter every way, in order to guard the more strongly against a common failing, viz. the resting in a string of unmeaning words, which really carry in them no certain or no consistent ideas. For so it is, that false systems generally have been kept up by such as

[l] Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. pp. 60, 67, 141. Compare my Appendix to Christian Sacrifice Explained, pp. 451–453 of this volume.

[m] See my Christian Sacrifice Explained, p. 441. Pet. Martyr. Comment. ad 1 Cor. pp. 48, 65. Zanchius, tom. vi. pp. 212, 215, alias ad Ephes. p. 424. Benedict. Aretius, Loc. Comm. p. 394. Pet. du Moulin, Buckler of Faith, p. 416. Anatome Missae, p. 168. Rivet. Summ. Controv. tom. ii. p. 108. Animadv. ad Cassand. p. 28.

[n] Cardinal Perron made use of that vaunting plea, that affected and foreign similitude, and was thus answered:—

'Stupenda prorsus est hominis audacia, veteribus tribuentis id de quo ne per somnium quidem cogitarunt. Quis enim illorum unquam observavit, aut tantillum subinnuit, eucharistiam hoc sensu antitypum appellari? Nullus, nemo.' Albertinus, p. 277: cp. pp. 437, 443, 471. [Cp. Salmas. pp. 26, 27.]

[o] 'Agnoscimus carnem vere vivificare, quatenus oblata fuit Deo . . . tanquam causa meritoria, sed non vivificare corporibus nostris receptam.' Rivet. tom. ii. p. 138.

intend not to deceive others, but are really deceived themselves: and it is difficult to persuade them to call over their ideas, or to examine their terms with due care.

2. To what has been said I shall only add, that it is worth considering, that many true and sound principles of our own Church, and of the ancient churches also, (as may be understood from what has been hinted,) must be given up, before we could admit the bread-sacrifice; and that when it is brought in, it can never find rest, till it thrusts out the sacrifice of the cross, as I have shewn elsewhere [p]. Some perhaps might modestly resolve to stop in the midway; but they would be the less consistent in doing it: for the natural, necessary, unavoidable consequence of the other principle, regularly pursued, must at length terminate in rejecting the cross-sacrifice. If our Eucharist is a sacrifice of the elements, so was our Lord's also; or else ours and his will not tally: and he must have sacrificed himself at the same time; or else other accounts will not answer [q]. And if such was the case, the sacrifice of the cross was effectually precluded, since our Lord was to make a sacrifice of himself but once [r]. The sacrifice of the cross cannot, in this way, be considered as a continuation of the sacrifice of the original Eucharist, for these reasons: 1. The subject-matter could not be the same: for neither bread nor wine could have any place in the oblation of the cross. 2. The number could not be one; for in the original Eucharist are supposed two sacrifices, the elemental and personal, whereas upon the cross there could be no more than the personal. 3. The form of the sacrifice could not be the same, but different as bloody and unbloody. 4. The priesthood (which is most material) could not be the same: for it is denied that Christ offered at the cross a Melchizedekian sacrifice [s], or

[p] Appendix, chap. iv. p. 470, &c.

[q] Ibid. p. 479.

[r] Ibid. pp. 475, 479.

[s] ['Si fuit in coena sacerdos, ut volunt, juxta ordinem Melchisedech, in cruentum offerendo sacrificium, qualis in cruce sacerdos fuit, ubi sanguis est effusus? Nil deest ad illorum stultitiam ecclesiae propinandam, nisi ut dicant (quemadmodum insipidissimus rabula Smythaeus aliquando scripsit, et postea publice Londini A.D. 1549, ad crucem D. Pauli recantavit) Christum in cruce tantum fuisse sacerdotem secundum ordinem Aaronis.' Pet. Mart. contr. Gardin. p. 60. Cp. Fulke in Heb. vii. pp. 748, 749. Heskyns (1566), b. i.

offered as a Melchizedekian priest[t]. 5. Lastly, the value could not be the same: for two must be supposed better than one, if each of them has its respective value; or if not, why was not one of them spared? And a Melchizedekian sacrifice must be supposed the most honourable and the most valuable of any, and so of course must supersede all other. In short, the cross-sacrifice, in this way, must either be excluded, or else grievously disparaged, by being brought in as second, and inferior to the higher sacrifice before made in the Eucharist. Some learned persons, ancient and modern, have reasonably conceived three several parts or views of one continued oblation of Christ our Lord[u]: but then they have conceived it in quite another sense, and upon very different principles, nothing at all akin to the notion of the bread-sacrifice. They might, in their way, consistently maintain one continued oblation; which others cannot, for the reasons just mentioned. Therefore, though it is a very great error to reject the sacrifice of the cross, yet since it is but the necessary consequence of the principle before mentioned, and is no more than arguing right from wrong premises; it seems that the first or greatest fault lies in retaining the principle, after it is clearly seen what company it must go with, and what precipices it leads to. I forbear to press these matters further, and should have been glad to have had no occasion for pressing them so far. May God give a blessing to what is sincerely intended for the service of truth and godliness: and may that Divine Spirit which accompanies the word and sacraments, and dwells in all the faithful, grant us a sound judgment and a right understanding in all things.

c. 13. p. 28. c. 28; p. 70. Vasquez. 533. Alanus, 534. Appendix 41, 54, 28.]

[t] See Appendix, above, p. 463 &c., 471.

[u] See Review, above, p. 337.

DISTINCTIONS OF SACRIFICE:

SET FORTH IN

A CHARGE

DELIVERED IN PART TO

THE CLERGY OF MIDDLESEX,

At the Easter Visitation, 1740.

Nos panem et vinum, in usu sacrae Coenae, sanctificari concedimus: sacrificari nunquam dabimus. Mason. de Minister. Anglican. p. 575.

Reverend Brethren,

Though I have dwelt some time upon the Christian sacrifice, perhaps even to a degree of tediousness; yet considering the great importance of the subject, I am not willing to dismiss it, while I see room left for throwing in any further light upon it. This may be done, as I conceive, by a more minute consideration of the several distinctions, or names of distinction, which sacrifice, of one kind or other, has passed under, in Church writers; those especially of the earlier times, not neglecting others of later date.

My design therefore, at present, is to bring together into one summary view the most noted distinctions, or names of distinction; and to explain them one by one, taking in the authorities proper to illustrate their meaning, or to signify their use.

I.

The first and most comprehensive division, or distinction of sacrifice, is into four several kinds, denominated from so many several kinds of religion; Patriarchal, Pagan, Mosaic, and Christian.

1. The Patriarchal sacrifices commenced, very probably, soon after the fall, and consisted of slain beasts [a], prefiguring Christ to be slain, pursuant to some Divine appointment [b]. Certain it is, that Cain and Abel offered sacrifices, and that very early [c]; one, of the fruits of the earth; and the other, of cattle [d]. Such

[a] This hath been probably collected from Gen. iii. 21. See Patrick and other commentators.

[b] See my first Charge of 1731, Works, vol. v. p. 20. Cp. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. cap. 10. p. 35.

[c] A.M. 130. Bedford's Scripture Chronol. p. 126.

[d] Gen. iv. 3, 4.

were the patriarchal sacrifices strictly so called, of the material and extrinsic kind. No doubt but the good Patriarchs offered spiritual sacrifices besides: but those were Gospel sacrifices, (as the Gospel, in some sense, obtained even from the time of the fall [e],) and therefore I reckon not them as purely patriarchal.

2. The second branch of this division concerns the Pagan sacrifices; which appear to have been little else but the patriarchal, variously corrupted, at different times, and in different degrees, by superstitious additions or mutilations [f].

3. The Mosaical sacrifices were the patriarchal augmented, regulated, and very minutely diversified, by Divine authority.

4. The Christian sacrifices are what both the patriarchal and Mosaical, strictly so called, pointed to: they are the things signified, the truth, the substance, the antitypes or archetypes of those types, signs, figures, shadows. Christians have a sacrifice of which they participate, and whereupon they feast, which is no other than the grand sacrifice itself, whereof the patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices were types, or prefigurations: and Christians have sacrifices, which they devoutly offer up as presents [g] to the Divine Majesty: those are their spiritual sacrifices, (all reducible to one, namely, self-sacrifice,) whereof the patriarchal sacrifices were signs or symbols [h]. So much, in the general, of the first distinction, or fourfold division: some particulars just hinted shall be explained in the sequel, in the places proper. I proceed to a second distinction.

[e] See my Review, above, p. 280.

[f] 'Tantum interest inter sacrificia Paganorum et Hebraeorum, quantum interest inter imitationem errantem, et praefigurationem praenuntiantem.' Augustin. contr. Faust. lib. xxi. cap. 21. p. 348. Cp. lib. xxii. cap. 17. p. 370. ed. Bened.

[g] Note, That the two oldest names of sacrifice are 'mincha' (Gen. iv. 3) and 'corban' (Levit. i. 2), both signifying a gift, or present; and in that case, a gift to God. This observation may be of use to cut off all fruitless speculations upon the critical meaning of the younger name *θυσία*, in the Greek, and to vindicate the propriety of the appellation, as to spiritual services, the noblest of all presents to a spiritual Being.

[h] Of the difference between a type and a symbol, see Outram de Sacrificiis, p. 203. A type, strictly, is an image or figure of things future: but a symbol is an image or figure of things at large, whether past, present, or to come. So that 'symbol' is a more general name than 'type;' though they are sometimes used promiscuously in ancient writers.

II.

Sacrifices may be considered either in an active view as offered, or in a passive view as participated. The Jewish Passover, or paschal lamb, for instance, might be considered as a sacrifice offered up to God by the priests, or as a sacrifice participated by the people who feasted upon it. The case is the same, so far, with our Lord's sacrifice: for he is our Passover, sacrificed for us[i]. He is the Lamb of God, as he offered himself up a sacrifice to God: he is our Paschal Lamb, as we participate of him, and feed upon him[k]. This distinction of active and passive sacrifice is not met with among the ancients, in terms: but it is sufficiently warranted by the ideas of the New Testament, and by the doctrine of the primitive Churches; and it is founded in the very reason and nature of things. To explain this matter, let it be observed, that our Lord's sacrifice, actively considered, as a proper act of sacrificing, was performed once for all, was one transient act: but the subject-matter of it, viz. Christ himself, and the virtue of that sacrifice, are permanent things, to be for ever commemorated, exhibited, participated. Christ entered into heaven with 'his own blood[l];' and in virtue of the cross-sacrifice, he 'abideth a priest continually, ever living to make intercession for us[m].' In such a sense his sacrifice abides, and we perpetually participate of it; sometimes symbolically, as in the two Sacraments; and at other times without symbols, by faith only and good life. In this sense it is that Christians are said to 'have an altar whereof to eat[n]:' and if an altar, they must have a sacrifice, for the same reason, and in the like sense. The same thing is intimated by St. Paul, in the comparison

[i] 1 Cor. v. 7.

[k] Ferus, a learned and moderate Romanist, who died A.D. 1554, expressed this matter very justly, and after the Protestant way.

'In Ecclesia autem, sacrificium nostrum est Christus: qui semel quidem seipsum obtulit, memoria tamen et repraesentatio ejus sacrificii quotidie in Ecclesia fit. Juxta hoc, offerre debemus sacrificium laudis, item sacrificium justitiae, imo nos ipsos.' Joan. Fer. in Genes. cap. viii. p. 248. A.D. 1550.

[l] Heb. ix. 12.

[m] Ibid. vii. 3, 25.

[n] Ibid. xiii. 10. See my Review, above, p. 95, &c.

which he draws between the partakers of the Jewish altar and the Christian communicants[o]: for as the Jews literally feasted upon the typical sacrifices, so Christians spiritually feast upon the body and blood of Christ, the true and grand sacrifice. Therefore Christ's sacrifice is our sacrifice, but in the passive sense, for us to partake of, not to give unto God. Christ once gave himself to God for us, and now gives himself to us, to feast upon, not to sacrifice. This distinction is worth the noting, for the explaining numerous passages of the Fathers; either, where they speak of Christ himself as the Church's sacrifice[p], or where they consider the grand sacrifice as dispensed or communicated[q] in the Eucharist, by and through the symbols, to as many as are worthy.

But while Scripture and Fathers thus speak of Christ himself, or of his body and blood, as the sacrifice whereof Christians partake, that is, of sacrifice in the passive sense, or passive view, with respect to us the receivers of it; yet the same Scripture and Fathers do as plainly and as frequently speak of other sacrifices belonging to Christians, such as they actively offer up to God, and present as their own sacrifices, the best they have to give; and those are their spiritual sacrifices, of which I shall say more under a distinct head, in its place. Enough, I hope, hath been said for the explaining both the meaning and the use of the distinction between active and passive sacrifice, between performing a sacrifice, and participating of what has been sacrificed. Our religious duties or services are our only sacrifices in the active view; and Christ once offered is our only sacrifice in the passive or receptive view; as was

[o] 1 Cor. x. 16–21.

[p] See Christian Sacrifice Explained, pp. 418, 419.

[q] 'Memoriam sui ad altare tuum, Deus, fieri desideravit [Monica] cui nullius diei intermissione servierat, unde sciret dispensari victimam sacram, qua deletum est chirographum quod erat contrarium nobis.' Augustin. Confess. lib. ix. cap. 13. p. 170. tom. i. edit. Bened.

'Ut jam de cruce commendaretur nobis caro et sanguis Domini, novum sacrificium.' Augustin. in Ps. xxxiii. p. 211. tom. iv.

'Quod addidit, manducare panem, etiam ipsum sacrificii genus eleganter expressit, de quo dicit sacerdos ipse, panis quem ego dedero, caro mea pro saeculi vita. Ipsum est sacrificium, non secundum Aaron, sed secundum Melchizedech.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 5. p. 466. tom. vii.

formerly well distinguished by a moderate Roman Catholic [r], who met with hard usage for so freely speaking the truth. But I pass on.

III.

Another very noted and necessary distinction is between sacrifice extrinsic and intrinsic. Christians have no extrinsic sacrifice but Christ; and that with regard to participation only, as before hinted: all their other sacrifices, wherein they themselves are the sacrificers, are of the intrinsic kind, are 'ab intus,' from within the persons themselves; being either good thoughts, good words, or good ways, all of them issues of the heart [s]. This is ancient and catholic doctrine: for thus did the primitive Fathers distinguish the Christian sacrifices from the sacrifices of Jews and Pagans; which were of the extrinsic kind, were extraneous to the man, such as sheep, goats, beeves, fruits, cakes, or the like. What Barnabas says of God's now requiring an human oblation, instead of the old legal sacrifices [t], may best be interpreted by this key: it is the man that God requires as his sacrifice; and he is to give to God, not things extrinsic, but his whole self, his soul and body, his mind and heart [u].

Origen expresses the distinction in plain and broad terms, observing that every good man has his sacrifice in himself [v]:

[r] 'Rite in missa dicitur a sanctis Patribus offerri et sacrificari corpus Christi. 1. Eo sensu quo asserunt Ecclesiam offerre in missa semetipsam et preces. 2. Quia in missa repraesentatur et commemoratur sacrificium crucis et passionis Christi, nuncupatur sacrificium commemorativum. 3. Capiendo sacrificium passive, pro sacrificato, noviter applicato nobis, asseritur rite sacrificium missae; quia in ea continetur corpus Christi quod fuit vere sacrificatum in unico illo sacrificio crucis.' Joan. Barnes. Catholico Roman. Pacific. in Brown. Fascic. tom. ii. p. 849.

[s] Prov. iv. 23.

[t] 'Haec ergo [sacrificia] vacua fecit, ut nova lex Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae sine jugo necessitatis est, humanam habeat oblationem. . . . Nobis enim dicit, sacrificium Deo cor tribulatum,' &c. Barnab. Epist. c. ii. p. 55. Compare my Review, above, p. 314.

[u] 'Deus non pecudis sanguine, sed hominis pietate placatur.' Lactant. Epist. p. 204.

'Non vult ergo sacrificium trucidati pecoris, sed vult sacrificium contriti cordis.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 241. tom. vii.

[v] 'Unusquisque nostrum habet in se holocaustum suum, et holocausti sui ipse succendit altare, ut semper ardeat.' Origen. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243.

that he sends it up to God from within, from his own self: that sons, or daughters, or farms, or cattle, are all of them extraneous, or extrinsic, to the man: that self-sacrifice is beyond all other, as it is copying after the example of Christ [x]. Origen was not singular in thus commending self-sacrifice, as the best of any, and the sum total of all: other ancient Fathers of the Church have done the like [y]. It is a maxim of truth, and of common sense, that self-sacrifice is always the best that any person or persons can offer, because it comprehends them and all theirs. An angel's self-sacrifice is the most that such angel can offer, and our Lord's self-sacrifice was the most that he could offer, and every man's self-sacrifice is the most that such man can offer. There is a seeming objection to this truth, drawn from the consideration of an authorized minister's offering up to God his own people; who, collectively at least, must be owned to be better than he. But then it is to be remembered, that such authorized minister therein acts 'in persona ecclesiae,' in a public capacity, as an officer of the church [z]; and so it is the whole church which offers what is offered in and through him. But I return.

To Origen I may subjoin Lactantius, who rejects all extrinsic sacrifice, everything extraneous to the man; alleging that God requires only what comes from within; from the heart, not from the chest; offered up by the mind, not by the hand [a]. This

[x] 'Vota autem Domino offerre nemo potest, nisi qui habet aliquid in semetipso, et in substantia sua, quod offerat Deo. . . . Filium offerre, vel filiam, aut pecus, aut praedium, hoc totum extra nos est. Semetipsum Deo offerre, et non alieno labore, sed proprio placere, hoc est perfectius et eminentius omnibus votis: quod qui facit, imitator est Christi.' Origen. in Num. Hom. xxiv. p. 364. ed. Bened.

[y] See references to them in Christian Sacrifice Explained, Append. p. 452, above.

[z] See Christian Sacrifice Explained, Append. p. 452, above.

Object. 1. May not the value of an offering, by Divine institution, be made to rise higher than the value of the man? No: for if it is made the man's property, (and otherwise he cannot give or sacrifice it,) the proprietor is still more valuable than the property, as containing it. Object. 2. Is not the offering Christ to view, more valuable than offering ourselves? No: because it is service only, and no service is more valuable than the servant himself: besides, such offering to view is not sacrificing Christ: so the objection runs wide of the point.

[a] 'Quid igitur ab homine desiderat Deus, nisi cultum mentis, qui est purus et sanctus? Nam illa quae

is not excluding good services, whether external or internal, whether mental, vocal, or manual: for they are intrinsic to the person, are as the man himself, amounting to, or resolving into self-sacrifice. What our Lord says of evil thoughts, words, and deeds, that they come from within, and out of the heart [b], must be equally true of all good services; for the reason is the same in both. This I hint, lest any one should interpret intrinsic sacrifice of mental service only, exclusive of vocal or manual, confounding intrinsic sacrifice with internal, which is of different consideration, and belongs to another head of division, as will be seen in the sequel. But I proceed to other authorities.

Chrysostom understood the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic sacrifice, rejecting the one as Jewish, and recommending the other as proper to the Gospel: those he says were from without, these from within [c]. His disciple Isidore fell in with the like sentiments, in his reflections on Rom. xii. 1, 'Present your bodies a living sacrifice [d],' &c. St. Austin is very clear and expressive on the same head: for after rejecting all extrinsic sacrifice, (actively considered,) he then asks the question, 'What? have we therefore nothing to offer? Shall we so come before God? So hope to appease him?' He answers: 'By all means offer: you have within you what you are to offer. Look not abroad for frankincense, but say, In me are thy sacrifices of praise, O God, which I am to render thee. Seek not abroad for cattle to slay; you have within yourself what you should slay. The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit [e].' I may here-

aut digitis fiunt, aut extra hominem sunt, inepta, fragilia, ingrata sunt. Hoc est sacrificium verum, non quod ex arca, sed quod ex corde profertur; non quod manu, sed quod mente libatur. Haec acceptabilis victima, quam de seipso animus immolaverit.' Lactant. Epist. cap. lviii. p. 172. Cp. Zen. Veron. in Psal. xlix.

[b] Matt. xv. 18, 19. Mark vii. 15, 23.

[c] *Ἐκεῖναι μὲν γὰρ πλούτου καὶ τῶν ἐχόντων εἰσὶν, αὗται δὲ ἀρετῆς. Ἐκεῖναι ἔξωθεν, αὗται ἔνδοθεν.* Chrysost. in Heb. cap. vi. Hom. 11. p. 115. tom. xii. Bened. ed.

[d] Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. Epist. 75. p. 284.

[e] 'Nihil ergo offeremus? Sic veniemus ad Deum? Et unde illum placabimus? Offer sane: in te habes quod offeras. Noli extrinsecus thura comparare, sed dic, In me sunt, Deus, vota tua, quae reddam laudis tibi. Noli extrinsecus pecus quod mactes inquirere: habes in te quod occidas. Sacrificium Deo spiritus contribulatus,' &c. Augustin. in Psal. l. p. 473. tom. iv. Cp. pp. 14, 364, 527–529.

upon remark, that St. Austin would not say in this case, Offer Christ: for though Christ is our sacrifice to commemorate, or to feast upon, he is not our sacrifice to offer up in a proper sacrificial sense. Much less would he say, Sacrifice bread and wine; for they are things extrinsic, as much as cattle or frankincense, and cannot be the subject-matter of a Gospel sacrifice, any more than the other. What then was the only sacrifice left for a Christian actively and properly to offer? The man himself, (or his services, which amount to the same thing,) that was still left: and there St. Austin very justly and very consistently fixed the Christian sacrifice, (actively considered,) as he always does.

IV.

I pass on to another ancient and useful distinction of sacrifice, into visible and invisible. A distinction near akin to the former, or rather resolving into it. Pagan and Jewish sacrifices were visible; but the Christian sacrifices were deemed invisible; not every way, but in respect of their invisible source, as arising from within, from the heart or mind, which is seen to God only. Lactantius argues, that our sacrifices ought to be invisible, that so they may suit the better with an invisible Deity[f]. St. Austin has the same distinction between visible and invisible sacrifices, meaning by the visible the noted sacrifices of Jews and Pagans, and by the invisible, the sacrifices made by good Christians only, the Gospel sacrifices. In one place he observes, that the Jewish sacrifices, which God's people now read of only, and do not use, were signs of the evangelical; and thereupon he says, that 'a visible sacrifice is a Sacrament, or holy sign, of an invisible sacrifice[g].' In another place, arguing, 'ex hypothesi,' against Porphyrius and other Pagans, (whose principle it was, to offer

[f] 'Si enim Deus non videtur, ergo his rebus coli debet quae non videntur.' Lactant. de Ver. Cult. lib. vi. cap. 25.

[g] 'Nec quod ab antiquis Patribus talia sacrificia facta sunt in victimis pecorum (quae nunc Dei populus legit, non facit) aliud intelligendum est, nisi rebus illis eas res fuisse significatas quae aguntur in nobis, ad hoc ut inhaereamus Deo, et ad eundem finem proximo consulamus. Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii Sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum est.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 241. tom. vii.

what they called invisible sacrifices to God supreme, and what they called visible, to inferior deities,) he pleads, that both the visible and invisible ought to go to the supreme only; those being signs of these, and requiring the same direction, to the same Deity: and hereupon he observes, that the persons themselves are, or ought to be, that invisible sacrifice, whereof the visible are the signs [h]. St. Austin here builds upon this Christian maxim, that what some call visible sacrifice, is really no better than the sign, shell, shadow, of true sacrifice; and that it is no more true sacrifice, than articulate sounds are sense, or words are ideas. Nothing with him is true sacrifice, or acceptable sacrifice, or evangelical sacrifice, (for those are so many phrases reciprocal and tantamount,) but the invisible sacrifice, the sacrifice of the heart, of the mind, of the man, for the mind is the man.

One may justly wonder what some Divines, among the Romanists, have meant, who, in order to maintain an extrinsic sacrifice in the Eucharist, have laid hold of Austin's account of a visible sacrifice, (that is, of a sign, shell, shadow,) as amounting to a definition of true or proper sacrifice [i]. They could not have contrived a shorter or surer way to depreciate the eucharistical sacrifice. For since it is manifest, that St. Austin rejected those called visible sacrifices, as what never were true sacrifices, (in his sense of true,) even when required under the law, and are not required at all, under the notion of sacrifice, by the Gospel [k], the advancing of signs now into proper sacrifices is but a kind of

[h] 'Qui autem putant haec visibilia sacrificia Diis aliis congruere, illi vero tanquam invisibili invisibilia, et majori majora, meliorique meliora, qualia sunt purae mentis, et bonae voluntatis officia; profecto nesciunt haec ita esse signa eorum, sicut verba sonantia signa sunt rerum. Quocirca, sicut orantes atque laudantes, ad eum dirigimus significantes voces, cui res ipsas in corde, quas significamus, offerimus, ita sacrificantes non alteri visibile sacrificium offerendum esse noverimus, quam illi cujus in cordibus nostris invisibile sacrificium nos ipsi esse debemus.' Augustin. ibid. lib. x. cap. 19. p. 255.

[i] 'Sacrificium, proprie dictum, est sacrum signum.' Sylvius, tom. iv. p. 624. 'Sacrificium est invisibilis sacrificii visibile Sacramentum.' Bayus, lib. iii. cap. 2. p. 210.

[k] 'In hujus prophetae verbis utrumque distinctum est, satisque declaratum, illa sacrificia per seipsa non requirere Deum, quibus significantur haec sacrificia quae requirit Deus.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 242.

will-worship, or sacrilegious usurpation. The sacramental elements are not that true sacrifice which St. Austin so often speaks of, but the signs of it[l]; not that true eucharistical sacrifice which that Father so magnificently sets forth, but the shadows of it[m]. And what can give a man a meaner idea of the eucharistical oblation and sacerdotal sacrifice, than the placing it in the signs of true sacrifice, and thereby setting it much lower than the private but true sacrifice of every single laic of the Church? In short, St. Austin's true sacrifice was really self-sacrifice[n], the same with his invisible sacrifice: and his eucharistical sacrifice was the offering up the collective body of Christians, the whole Church or city of God[o]. But of this I may say more in a proper place. All that I shall observe further here is, that St. Austin never once gives (so far as appears) the name of visible sacrifice to anything which he esteemed true sacrifice, or Gospel sacrifice, justly so called. What he said of visible sacrifice, in the two passages before cited, related purely to the Jewish and Pagan sacrifices, which he opposed to the invisible, that is, to the Christian sacrifices. He does indeed sometimes speak of the Christian sacrifices, as appearing[p], or being seen; that is, in such a sense as things invisible may be said to be seen by their signs, or reasonably collected and inferred from what appears out-

[l] 'Quod ab omnibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificii.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 5. p. 242.

[m] Nazianzen expressly teaches the same thing, where he declares that the outward oblation is but as shadow to truth, in respect of the true and spiritual sacrifices.

Οἶδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, οὗ τύπος τὰ νῦν ὁρῶμενα . . . . τούτῳ παραστήσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτὰ, θυσίαν, καὶ προσφορὰν, καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἡ ἀλήθεια. Nazianz. Orat. xxviii. p. 484. See my Review, above, pp. 342–345.

'Gregorius affirmat oblationem illam quae fit in Eucharistia, esse umbram ac imaginem oblationum nostrarum spiritualium, ac iis longe inferiorem.' Albertinus, p. 474. The reader may compare Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 32, if disposed to observe what may be said, where no just answer can be given. Albertinus had foreclosed all evasions: and yet no notice was taken of him.

[n] Augustin. tom. v. p. 268; tom. vii. pp. 242–244, 256, 260, 569, 609, 674; tom. viii. pp. 349, 568; tom. x. p. 94. ed. Bened.

[o] Vid. tom. vii. pp. 243, 244, 256, 260, 569, 674.

[p] 'Ibi quippe primum apparuit sacrificium quod nunc a Christianis offertur Deo, toto orbe terrarum,' &c. Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xvi. cap. 22. p. 435. tom. vii.

'Cum videt sacrificium Christianorum toto orbe terrarum,' &c. Ibid. lib. xvii. cap. 5. p. 465.

wardly. Good works are seen by men, and they are sacrifices: but they are not seen as good, or as sacrifices, except to God only, who alone sees the heart. Good Christians are a sacrifice to God in St. Austin's account, and they are visible, as men: nevertheless, he calls them an invisible sacrifice, because in their sacrificial capacity they are seen to God only, the searcher of hearts. He would not allow that Satan himself could see what Job did, when he sacrificed unto God: Job was visible, but his sacrifice was invisible; because it was true sacrifice, arising from the heart [q]. From what hath been noted under this article, it may sufficiently appear, that the Gospel sacrifices are of the invisible kind, as contradistinguished from the visible sacrifices of Jews and Pagans; and that they have had the name of invisible, on the same account as they had the name of intrinsic; and so both the names resolve into one and the same notion. By these accounts, the bread and wine of the Eucharist could not be considered as Gospel sacrifices, being that they are 'ab extra,' and open to view; and as they are not intrinsic, so neither are they invisible, either in themselves or in their source.

V.

Another, more ancient and more famed distinction of sacrifice, was into material and immaterial, or corporeal and incorporeal: the Christian sacrifices were of the immaterial and incorporeal kind, and as such distinguished from the Jewish and Pagan sacrifices, which were material and corporeal. This distinction is as old as Justin Martyr, who rejected the sacrifices of Jews or Pagans, as material sacrifices. Such material things, he says, God has no need to receive of us, but that he accepts only of the men themselves, while copying after the Divine perfections, purity, righteousness, philanthropy, and the like [r]. This was

[q] 'Ablatis omnibus, solus remansit Job: sed in illo erant vota laudis quae redderet Deo. In illo plane erant: arcam pectoris sui fur diabolus non invaserat. Plenus erat unde sacrificaret. Deus videbat in corde servi sui cultum suum gratuitum: placebat illud cor in conspectu Domini, in luce viventium. Diabolum latebat, quia in tenebris erat.' August. in Psal. lvi. pp. 528, 529, tom. iv.

[r] 'Αλλ' *οὐ δέεσθαι τῆς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὑλικῆς προσφορᾶς προσειλήφαμεν τὸν Θεὸν, αὐτὸν παρέχοντα πάντα ὁρῶντες· ἐκείνους δὲ προσδέχεσθαι αὐτὸν μόνον δεδιδάγμεθα καὶ πεπείσμεθα, καὶ*

pleaded in answer to the Pagan charge of impiety, thrown upon Christians for not using material sacrifices. Justin tacitly admits the charge as to fact, that the Christians did not use such sacrifices; but in vindication of their conduct in that article, he pleads that God had no need of material sacrifices: which in his phraseology, as circumstances shew, amounted to saying, that God did not require them, but indeed rejected them. This appears very plainly by his use of the like phrase soon after, with respect to blood, libations, and incense, which, without all question, Justin understood to have been absolutely rejected: yet Justin, even in that case also, pleaded that God had no need of them [s]. He chose, very probably, that form of speaking, by way of oblique reproof to the Pagans, for their gross sentiments, in conceiving that the Deity had need of such offerings. Other Fathers, in the same cause, made use of the phrase of 'no need,' exactly in the same way; so as not barely to teach that God is all-sufficient, but intimating withal, that God had really rejected what he is there said to have no need of [t]: otherwise their arguments on that head would have been of no force to justify the conduct of Christians in their not admitting such or such sacrifices. It is observable, that in both the places where Justin speaks of the sacrifices which God has no need of, he uses the phrase in direct opposition to such sacrifices as God accepts of; which makes it still plainer, that that phrase, as it there stands, is used as equivalent to disallowing, or rejecting. But to clear the matter up yet further, so as to cut off all evasive pretences or reserves, (as if Justin had left room for a material sacrifice in some shape or other,) it is worth noting, that he distinctly points out what is to be offered to man, and what to God, in the Eucharist: all the material part, all that God gives for nutriment, is to be offered to ourselves and to the needy, and to God are to be sent up hymns

πιστεύομεν τοὺς τὰ πράσσοντα αὐτῷ ἀγαθὰ μιμουμένους, σωφροσύνην, καὶ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ ὅσα οἰκεῖα Θεῷ ἐστι. Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 14. Compare my Review, above, p. 317.

[s] *Ἀνενδεῆ αἱμάτων, καὶ σπονδῶν, καὶ θυμιαμάτων.* Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 19. See Review, above, p. 317, and Dodwell of Incense, p. 46.

[t] Athenagoras, pp. 48, 49. Clem. Alex. pp. 836, 848. Tertullian ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. Arnobius, lib. vi. pp. 190, 191. Lactantius, Epit. c. lviii. pp. 171, 172.

and praises [u]. Justin could never have expressed himself in that manner, had he thought that any part of that material nutriment was to be a sacrifice unto God. The words are very emphatical. We are not to burn it, as the Pagans did: well, what then are we to do with it? May we not *προσφέρειν*, offer it up as a sacrifice? No; but we must offer it, in a lower sense, to man. What then is to be offered up to God? Nothing? Yes, thanks, praises, hymns, and the like: that is God's tribute, that is a sacrifice fit for him, and worthy of him. I have dwelt the longer upon this Father, because of his great antiquity and authority, and because his sentiments on this head have been sometimes widely mistaken by contending parties.

I pass on to Lactantius [v], who has the same distinction with Justin, but under the names of corporeal and incorporeal, instead of material and immaterial: he argues, that since God is incorporeal, he ought to have a sacrifice suitable, that is, incorporeal. Nay, he argues further, that no other kind of sacrifice ought to be offered him, and that he requires no other [w]. It is observable, that his incorporeal sacrifices take in mental, vocal, and manual services; all good works [x], external or internal, coming

[u] Τὸ τὰ ὑπ' ἐκείνου εἰς διατροφὴν γινόμενα, οὐ πυρὶ δαπανᾷν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις προσφέρειν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ εὐχαρίστους ὄντας διὰ λόγου πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους πέμπειν. Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 19.

Literally thus:

'Not to consume by fire the creatures made for nutriment, but to offer them to ourselves, and to the needy; and thankfully to send up to him [God] by speech, praises and hymns.'

N.B. Mr. Reeves has diluted the meaning of this passage by a translation too paraphrastical. It cannot be supposed that Justin meant only, that such things should not be offered to God by wasting, burning; for he declares plainly what things are to be presented to God, and what to man: besides that the taking from such offerings the very essential characteristics of all material presents to God, is the same with forbidding them to be used as presents, or considered as presents to the Divine Majesty.

[v] 'Sicut corporalibus corporalia, sic utique incorporali incorporale sacrificium necessarium est.' Lactant. Epit. c. lxviii. p. 171. 'Duo sunt quae offerri debeant, donum et sacrificium. . . . . Deo utrumque incorporale offerendum est, quo utitur. Donum est integritas animi, sacrificium, laus et hymnus.' Lactant. Instit. lib. vi. c. 24. Compare my Review, above, pp. 339, 340.

[w] 'Quid igitur ab homine desiderat Deus, nisi cultum mentis, qui est purus et sanctus?' See above, p. 550.

[x] 'Hic cultor est veri Dei, cujus sacrificia sunt mansuetudo animi, et vita innocens et actus boni.' Lactant. Instit. lib. vi. c. 24.

from a good mind. Bodily service is performed indeed by the body, as the instrument: but that service is not a bodily substance, not a material thing; as a sheep, a bullock, a cake, a loaf, or a vessel of wine is. Lactantius's notion of sacrifice includes all acts of obedience, all true services of the man[y]; but it excludes everything extraneous to the man, from being the subject-matter of his sacrifice: so that this distinction of corporeal and incorporeal, or of material and immaterial, differs only (if it at all differs) in a mode of conception from the distinction of extrinsic and intrinsic, before explained.

Eusebius recommends the Christian sacrifices as incorporeal, in opposition to the corporeal sacrifices of Jews and Pagans[z]. Basil in like manner observes, that God rejects corporeal sacrifices[a]. Chrysostom also bears his testimony to the same thing, and in words of like import, where he speaks of the converted Jews as relinquishing their corporeal services, upon their embracing Christianity[b]. Cyril, after observing that beeves, sheep, turtles, pigeons, fruits, fine flour, cakes, incenses, are all discarded under the Gospel, as too gross to be offered for sacrifice: and that Christians are commanded to offer up something more fine and more abstracted, more intellectual and spiritual, namely, meekness, faith, hope, charity, righteousness, temperance, obedience, dutifulness, praises, and all kinds of virtues, (not a word of bread or of wine in all this long list,) adds, 'For this sacrifice, as being purest from matter, is most worthy of the Deity, who is by nature uncompounded and immaterial[c].' To the same purpose writes

[y] 'Haec sunt opera, haec officia misericordiae; quae si quis obierit, verum et acceptum sacrificium Deo immolabit.' Lactant. Epit. p. 204. Cp. Minuc. Fel. sect. 32. p. 183. in Review, above, p. 332.

[z] *Ταύτας δὲ πάλιν τὰς ἀσωμάτους καὶ νοερὰς θυσίας τὰ προφητικὰ κηρύττει λόγια.* Euseb. Demonstr. lib. i. c. 10. p. 39: cp. 35, 36. Origen. in Psalm. pp. 563, 722. edit. Bened., and my Review, above, p. 340.

[a] *Παραιτεῖται τὰς σωματικὰς θυσίας.* Basil. Comm. in Isa. tom. i. p. 398. edit. Bened.

N.B. In Review, above, p. 345, I took notice, that the editor had rejected that piece as of doubtful authority, in his preface, tom. i. p. 48. But I have since observed, that in a later tome he altered his mind, and admitted it as genuine, giving his reasons, tom. iii. in Vita Basilii, c. 42. p. 179, &c.

[b] *Τὴν διὰ θυσιῶν καὶ ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν σωματικῶν ἀφέντες θεραπείαν.* Chrysost. adv. Judaeos, Hom. vii. p. 664. tom. i. ed. Bened. Cp. ad Roman. Hom. xx. p. 658. tom. x.

[c] *Ἀϋλοτάτη γὰρ αὕτη θυσία τῷ κατὰ φύσιν ἁπλῷ καὶ ἀΰλῳ πρέπουσα Θεῷ.*

Procopius, of the next succeeding century; observing that corporeal sacrifice is abolished, and spiritual established [d].

Could such writers, after all, believe bread or wine to be the sacrifice which God accepts? Are they finer than fine flour? Are they purer than cakes? Or say that they are: yet are they immaterial, or incorporeal? Or if even that were allowed, (which never can be allowed,) yet are they faith, or hope, or charity, or good mind, or good life? Every way they stand excluded. But still, colours have been invented, to evade the authorities here cited: sometimes it is said, that immaterial, or incorporeal, may not mean perfectly immaterial, but only less gross, or less feculent [e]. That is not very likely, if we consider that the immateriality or incorporeity of the sacrifice spoken of is understood to be analogous to God's immateriality or incorporeity, to which it is compared. But that is not all: for it is further to be considered, that the immaterial quality of the Christian sacrifices was commended by the Fathers, in opposition to the Jewish and Pagan sacrifices. Now had they really meant no more than that they were less gross, or less dreggy, such an argument could not have failed to introduce a very doubtful debate between them and their adversaries, viz. whether the Jewish and Pagan fine flour and cakes were not as free from dregs as the Christians' bread; and whether their libations were not of wine as pure, and as free from feculency, as any that the Christians could pretend to. Yet we find nothing recorded, no not so much as a hint of any such debate: wherefore it is much more reasonable, as well as more natural to suppose, that those plain Fathers, who were both wise and honest men, understood immaterial and

Cyrill. Alex. contr. Julian. lib. x. p. 345. Compare Review, above, p. 346. Dodwell on Incense, p. 89.

[d] Οὐκοῦν εὔδηλον ὡς τὸ σωματικὸν ἐκβαλὼν, τὸ πνευματικὸν πληροῦν ἐπαγγέλλεται. Procop. Gaz. in Isa. pp. 22, 23: cp. p. 493.

[e] 'When I call the eucharistic sacrifice material, I must here declare, that I mean nothing by it but that it has such a real corporeal extension, as natural bread and wine, as all other bodies are allowed to have; and that I do not intend it as a word of the same adequate import with the Greek ὑλικός. For I apprehend that some of the ancients may have asserted, that the eucharistic sacrifice is ἄϋλος, as well as ἀσώματος; but then they did not mean perfectly immaterial, or without bodily substance, but not gross or dreggy.' Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 27.

incorporeal in the usual and obvious sense of those words. And indeed the instances which they give to exemplify what they meant, such as hope, faith, virtue, all immaterial, (and those were their sacrifices,) demonstrate that they did so. I take no notice of some slighter evasions which have been offered, for fear of being tedious, or of giving offence to persons of true discernment.

VI.

I pass on to the famous distinction of bloody and unbloody sacrifice: a distinction, probably, borrowed from the Pythagorean philosophers[f] by the Christian Fathers of a philosophic turn, who, by some easy and proper refinements of the idea, adapted it to Christian purposes. Justin Martyr here seems to have led the way; who to the Pagan sacrifices of blood, and to their libations, opposes the true spiritual praises and thanksgivings offered up by Christians[g]. He did not say, unbloody, or spiritual bread and wine, but spiritual praises and thanksgivings. Athenagoras, of the same age, says, that it is meet to offer an unbloody sacrifice, and to bring a rational service[h]. Had he intended bread and wine by the unbloody sacrifice, this would have been the place wherein to have mentioned them: but he has not one word of them. All that he opposes to the sacrifices of blood, are the knowledge of God's works and ways, the lifting up holy hands, and the like; which, according to him, are *θυσία μεγίστη*, the noblest sacrifice; and therefore, undoubtedly, the same that he recommends under the names of unbloody sacrifice and rational service[i]. He had said before, God needs no blood, nor fat, nor scents, nor incense; that is, he does not now accept them. What then does he accept instead of blood, &c.? Did he say bread or wine? No: but he tells us of that greatest sacrifice, describing it as consisting of religious faith, and prayers, and services: those

[f] Vid. Clem. Alex. pp. 848, 849. ed. Ox.

[g] *Οὐ ἐν τῇ πάλιν παρουσίᾳ, μὴ δόξητε λέγειν Ἡσαΐαν, ἢ τοὺς ἄλλους προφήτας θυσίας ἀφ' αἱμάτων ἢ σπονδῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀναφέρεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀληθινοὺς καὶ πνευματικοὺς αἴνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας.* Just. Mart. Dial. p. 389. ed. Lond.

[h] *Προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν.* Athenag. Legat. p. 49.

[i] See my Review, above, p. 323, and compare Jewel's Answer to Harding, pp. 427, 428.

God accepts in opposition to blood, &c., wherefore those are what this Father recommended as unbloody sacrifice in the place now cited. The case is plain in the author himself, and will, besides, be abundantly confirmed by other similar passages in the Fathers that followed, whose testimonies I shall take in their order of time.

Tertullian, to the bloody sacrifices, opposes pure prayer [k]: not a word of pure bread and wine, as a Christian sacrifice in opposition to the other. But in another place, where he again recommended prayer sent up from a chaste body, an innocent soul, and a sanctified spirit, he adds, not worthless grains of frankincense, the tears of an Arabian tree, nor two drops of wine [l]. He must have been very imprudent, not to say worse, in touching upon so tender an article as the two drops of wine, had he conceived that such in part was the real sacrifice of every Christian communicant at the holy altar.

Origen [m], Lactantius [n], Eusebius [o], Austin [p], all state the opposition in the same way; not between bloody animals and bloodless bread or wine, (as they should have done upon the material scheme,) but between bloody sacrifices and sacrifices of the spiritual kind, such as prayers, praises, and good works. More particularly, Eusebius joins rational with unbloody, and calls it unbloody service, not unbloody elements, symbols, and the like [q].

[k] 'Sacrificamus — sed quomodo Deus praecepit pura prece: non enim eget Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris, aut sanguinis alicujus.' Tertull. ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. Compare my Review, above, pp. 329, 330.

[l] 'Offero ei opimam et majorem hostiam; quam ipse mandavit: orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de Spiritu Sancto profectam: non grana thuris unius assis, Arabicae arboris lacrymas, nec duas meri guttas,' &c. Tertull. Apol. c. xxx. p. 277. Cp. Arnob. lib. vi. p. 190. edit. Lugd. Bat.

[m] 'Decet enim Deo immolari victimam cordis, et hostiam contribulati spiritûs, non carnis et sanguinis jugulari.' Origen. in Num. Hom. xxiv. p. 363.

[n] 'Deus non pecudis sanguine, sed hominis pietate placatur.' Lactant. Epit. 204.

[o] Οὐ δι' αἱμάτων, ἀλλὰ δι' ἔργων εὐσεβῶν καθαρὰν ὠνομασμένην θυσίαν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀναφέρειν Θεῷ. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. c. vi. p. 19: cp. pp. 20, 21, 23, 39; in Psal. p. 212.

[p] 'Non vult ergo sacrificium trucidati pecoris, sed vult sacrificium contriti cordis.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei. lib. x. c. 5. p. 241.

[q] Θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 6. p. 20. Πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄναιμον καὶ καθαρὰν ἀποδιδοὺς αὐτῷ λατρείαν. Euseb. ibid. p. 21.

Eusebius further teaches, that the unbloody sacrifices will obtain in heaven [r]. From whence it is manifest, that he meant not the elements by that phrase, but religious services. Neither has there been produced so much as a single passage from his writings, where that phrase must mean the material elements, or where it may not reasonably mean religious acts, services, performances [s]. Attempts have been made upon a place or two [t], to warp them to another meaning, but so slight, and so easily seen through at once, that I shall not here trouble you with any particular confutation of them. The error lies in confounding the material things with the religious work; and the sacrificial instruments with the sacrificial service; that is, with the sacrifice itself. But I proceed.

The Emperor Constantine, in a letter to King Saporis, says, that Christians are content with unbloody prayers only, in supplicating God; and that prayer, free from blood and filth, together with the sign of the cross, was sufficient for victory [u]. Here we have the epithet unbloody directly applied to religious services, (not to material things;) so that there is no arguing from the Pagan application of that epithet to the Christian, which was widely different, as their sacrifices were different. It is in vain to plead, that the difference lay only in this, that the Jews and Pagans used animal sacrifices, and the Christians bloodless bread and wine: for then, why did not the Fathers mention unbloody bread and wine, rather than unbloody prayers?

[r] See the passage in my Review, above, p. 341. How sacrifices shall be offered in heaven, or what sacrifices, see Origen in Num. Hom. xviii. p. 359. ed Bened. Lactantius, Instit. lib. vi. c. 24. Augustin. tom. iv. p. 474; tom. vii. p. 610. Gregor. Magn. tom. iii. p. 509. ed. Bened.

[s] *Θυσίαις ἀναίμοις καὶ μυστίκαις ἱερουργίαις τὸ θεῖον ἱλάσκοντο.* Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 45. p. 651. *Ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς θυσίας, τὰς δι' εὐχῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτου θεολογίας, τοῖς αὐτοῦ θιασώταις τίς ἐπιτελεῖν παρέδωκεν ἄλλος, ἢ μόνος ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτήρ;* Euseb. de Laud. Constant. p. 768. ed. Cant. Cp. Demonstr. lib. i. c. 6, 10.

[t] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 21. N. B. Eusebius asks, 'Who but our Saviour ever taught his votaries to offer by prayer and an ineffable theology, these unbloody and rational sacrifices?' That is, memorial services; which is Eusebius's constant notion of the eucharistic sacrifices. Demonstr. Evang. pp. 27, 38, 39, 40. Compare my Review, above, p. 33.

[u] *Μόναις εὐχαῖς ἀναιμάκταις πρὸς ἱκεσίαν Θεοῦ ἀρχοῦνται . . . ἀποχρῆσαι αὐτῷ εἰς νίκην τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ σύμβολον . . . καὶ εὐχὴν καθαρὰν αἱμάτων καὶ ῥύπου.* Constantin. apud Sozom. lib. ii. c. 15. p. 63.

And why should they so industriously smother the true state of the competition, (if it were true,) and run off so wide, that nobody, by their way of speaking, could suspect any other, than that the opposition entirely lay between bloody victims and unbloody services of lauds, prayers, and good works? For those are what they directly call sacrifices, and what they expressly point to, as often as they specify or explain their unbloody sacrifices.

Cyril of Jerusalem in plain terms characterizes the spiritual sacrifice by unbloody service [x]. Now, as sure as that a service [y] is not a substance, and a spiritual sacrifice is not a corporeal host, so sure is it, that the epithet of unbloody belongs not to the elements in that passage of Cyril. There may be some doubt of what Cyril meant by the sacrifice of propitiation, in the same paragraph: but a wise interpreter will not therefore depart from what is clear and certain. What I apprehend is, that Cyril, by spiritual sacrifice and unbloody service, meant the consecratory service, whereby the elements became symbols of the real body and blood, symbols of the grand sacrifice. When the elements were once so constituted exhibitive symbols of the grand sacrifice, which is the true sacrifice of propitiation, Cyril scrupled not to give them the name of what they represented and exhibited, by an usual metonymy of sign for thing: for, in the very same way, he there also gave them the name of Christ slain [z], and of the most tremendous sacrifice [a]. The

[x] *Μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης.* Cyril. Mystag. v. sect. 8. p. 327. Compare Review, above, p. 223.

'After that the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service, is finished, upon that sacrifice of propitiation we beseech God in behalf of the common peace of the churches.'

[y] It has been sometimes pleaded, (Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 24) that service may import a material thing; and Exod. xii. 26, 27, is appealed to, as affording an example of it. But the whole context shews, that service there really means service, the celebration of the paschal sacrifice, the keeping that feast.

[z] *Χριστὸν ἐσφαγιασμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν. ἐξιλεούμενοι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεόν.* Cyril. Mystag. p. 328.

[a] *Τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης προκειμένης θυσίας.* Cyril. ibid. p. 327. Cp. Ephraem. Syr. de Sacerdot. pp. 2, 3. Chrysostom, tom. i. pp. 382, 383, 424; tom. vii. pp. 272, 310; tom. ix. p. 176; tom. xi. pp. 217, 218. Nazianz. Orat. xvii. p. 273.

symbols therefore, in a figure, are there called the sacrifice of propitiation; but the spiritual sacrifice and unbloody service, spoken of just before, express that service of ours, that sacrifice which we actively offer up, in order to the consecrating the elements into holy symbols, exhibitive of the grand sacrifice to every faithful receiver [b]. So that the phrases of spiritual sacrifices and unbloody service do here retain their usual meaning; and Cyril has neatly contrived to insinuate to his readers a just notion of the two sacrifices of the Eucharist; the one actively offered, and the other passively received or participated [c].

I pass on to Zeno of Verona, who lived about the same time with Cyril. He makes use of the same distinction of bloody and unbloody, while recommending the sacrifices of Christians as preferable to the animal sacrifices of Jews and Pagans [d]. By unbloody sacrifices, he understood clean thoughts and pure manners, intimating nothing of clean bread or pure wine, as set in competition with the bloody sacrifices. A strange omission, had he been at all aware that the elements were the proper Christian sacrifice.

Nazianzen speaks of his purifying the people at the mystical table, that is, in the Eucharist, with unbloody and perfect ordinances [e]. From whence it is plain, that he thought not the

[b] Cyril's whole context will set this matter clear.

Παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ· πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἂν ἐφάψαιτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται, καὶ μεταβέβληται. Εἶτα, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν, κ.τ.λ.

Here I understand ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης to refer to σῶμα and αἷμα Χριστοῦ, before mentioned. They are that sacrifice of propitiation into which the elements are supposed to be symbolically changed, by the spiritual sacrifice and unbloody service; that is, by the consecratory prayers and lauds, instrumentally, as by the Spirit efficiently. In a word, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης means the same, as if it had been said ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος ἐκείνου καὶ αἵματος. And indeed, if θυσίας had referred to πνευματικὴν θυσίαν next preceding, Cyril, probably, would have said, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης, not ἐκείνης.

[c] See above, p. 547, &c..

[d] 'Spiritali Deo sacrificium est necessarium spiritale, quod non ex sacculo, sed ex corde profertur: quod non bromosis pecudibus, sed suavissimis moribus comparatur; quod non cruentis manibus, sed sensibus mundis offertur; quod non jugulatur ut pereat, sed, sicut Isaac, immolatur ut vivat.' Zeno Veron. in Psal. xlix. This I take from Dodwell on Incense, pp. 97, 98.

[e] Ἐγὼ τραπέζης μυστικῆς παραστάτης,

epithet unbloody to be appropriated to material substance. And this may help to explain another passage of his, relating to Julian, whom he represents as desecrating his hands by profane blood, thereby wiping out the consecration he had received in Baptism, and washing his hands of the unbloody sacrifice [f]; that is, of the consecration received in the eucharistical solemnities. Had this plain sense of the place been thought on, there would have been no room left for the speculations which some have raised upon that passage [g].

There is another noted place of the same Father, where he speaks, I think, of the Pagans, set on by Arians, and defiling the unbloody sacrifices with the blood of men and of victims [h]. I see no reason for interpreting unbloody sacrifices, in this passage, at all differently from the common usage of that phrase in Church writers of those ancient times. Both the thought and the expression seem to be near akin to what Optatus uses, upon a like occasion, in relation to the rudeness and profaneness of some Donatists; who had overturned, as he terms it, the vows and desires of the people, together with the altars [i]. I suppose, Gregory might as properly and as reasonably say, that the devotions of the people were polluted in one case, as Optatus might say, that they were overturned in the other case: the expressions are alike rhetorical.

Asterius Amasenus, in a work ascribed to Gregory Nyssen, speaks expressly of incorporeal repentance and unbloody supplication, as obtaining in the Church, in the room of animal sacrifices [k]. So that the epithet unbloody, for the first four

'Εγὼ καθαίρω λαὸν, ὃν σοι προσφέρω,
'Εν τοῖς ἀναίμοις καὶ τελείοις δόγμασι.

Nazianz. Iamb. vol. ii. p. 182.

[f] Καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀφαγνίζεται, τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας ἀποκαθαίρων, δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων, καὶ τῆς θεότητος. Nazianz. Orat. i. p. 70.

[g] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 20.

[h] Θυσιαστηρίων κατορχούμενοι, καὶ τὰς ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας ἀνθρώπων καὶ θυσιῶν αἵμασι χραίνοντες. Nazianz. Orat. xx. p. 348.

[i] 'Vota et desideria hominum, cum ipsis altaribus, evertistis. Illac ad aures Dei ascendere solebat oratio.' Optat. contr. Parmen. lib. vi. p. 289.

[k] Ὅπερ δὲ ἦν τότε ὁ ἔνσαρκος μόσχος, τοῦτο νῦν ἐστὶ ἡ ἀσώματος μετάμέλεια, καὶ ἀναίματος δεήσις. Greg. Nyssen. de Poenit. p. 170. That work belongs to Asterius Amasenus of the fourth or fifth century. Vid. Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. tom. viii. p. 160.

centuries at least, appears not to have been so much as applied to the eucharistical elements, much less appropriated.

Some pieces have been quoted on this head[l], under the admired names of Athanasius and Chrysostom, which might have been worth examining, were they not now known to be spurious[m]. But Chrysostom, in his undoubted writings, abundantly discovers how he understood the distinction which we are now upon, by his opposing the bloody antiquated sacrifices, not to clean elements, but to Christian virtues, lauds, prayers, and good works[n]. Isidore Pelusiot uses the phrase of unbloody sacrifice[o], but without explication; so that his sense of it must be determined, either by his general doctrine elsewhere, or by the constant usage of contemporary writers.

St. Austin opposes to the antiquated bloody victims, the sacrifices of praise[p]. Cyril of Alexandria says that the angels of heaven offer unbloody sacrifices[q]. A very clear passage, by which we may reasonably interpret his meaning in other passages[r] not so clear, or left doubtful and undeterminate. I shall here take notice but of one, which runs thus: 'The table bearing the shewbread (proposition of loaves) signifies the unbloody sacrifice, by which we are blessed, while we eat the bread from heaven, that is, Christ[s]. Here the phrase of unbloody sacrifice

[l] Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 20.

[m] That ascribed to Athanasius is among the spuria of the Benedictine edition, tom. ii. p. 241.

The other ascribed to Chrysostom is among the spuria of the Benedictine edition, tom. v. p. 630.

[n] Chrysostom. contra Jud. Hom. vi. p. 648; Hom. vii. pp. 617, 664. tom. i. In Psal. iv. p. 20. In Psal. xlix. p. 231. In Joann. Hom. lxxiv. p. 437, tom. viii. In Heb. Hom. xi. pp. 115, 116. tom. xii.

[o] Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. Ep. 75. p. 284.

[p] Augustin. ad Honorat. Epist. cxi. p. 439. tom. ii.

[q] Cyrill. Alex. de Rect. Fide, p. 160. See my Review, above, pp. 342, 346.

[r] Cyrill. Alex. explicat. Anathem. xi. p. 156. De Adorat. in Spiritu, lib. xiii. p. 457. Epist. ad Nestor. p. 72. In Malach. p. 830.

[s] *Σημαίνει μὲν ἡ τράπεζα τὴν πρόθεσιν ἔχουσα τῶν ἄρτων, τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν δι' ἧς εὐλογούμεθα, τὸν ἄρτον ἐσθίοντες τὸν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, τουτέστι Χριστόν*, Cyrill. Alex. de Adorat. in Spirit. lib. xiii. p. 457.

N.B. This passage, or part of it, [in Unbloody Sacrifice, p. 20,] is strangely rendered thus: 'The table which had the shewbread denotes the unbloody sacrifice of the bread, or loaves.' Here *τῶν ἄρτων*, which belong to *πρόθεσιν* going before, (for *πρόθεσιν τῶν ἄρτων* amounts to the same with *τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως*,) are separated from *πρόθεσιν*, and *πρόθεσιν* alone is rendered shewbread, very oddly, that so *τῶν ἄρτων* may be thrown to *ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν*, to make an unbloody sacrifice of loaves in the

undoubtedly refers to the sacrament of the Eucharist, in and by which we are blessed, sanctified, &c. It may be a name for some part of the service, or for the whole solemnity, (as the whole is often denominated for some eminent part,) but cannot reasonably be construed as a name for the elements, considered as a material sacrifice. The bread from heaven, the thing signified, rather than the signs, would, by Cyril's account, have the better title to that name. But I apprehend, that the phrase of unbloody sacrifice in that place, denotes not the heavenly bread itself, nor the signs, but the memorial service performed by those signs, which is the usual signification of the phrase. Upon the whole, I may presume to say, that no clear testimony hitherto, within the six first centuries, has been produced, whereby to prove that unbloody sacrifice was ever made a name for the elements of the Eucharist. If the Fathers had entertained such a notion, no doubt but they could have expressed it, in words as clear and as full as the Church writers of the eighth[t] and following centuries expressed it; for they wanted no command of language: but since they never did so express it, but those later writers are (so far as appears) the first that did so; it is reasonable to conclude that such an use of that phrase came in about the time that transubstantiation (or something very like it) was creeping in. And it is no great wonder if the signs then came to be looked upon as the unbloody sacrifice, when they were believed to be or to contain the very things signified, the real body and blood that was once sacrificed upon the cross[u]. I would not be understood, by my tracing the use of the phrase of

Eucharist: not considering, that ἄρτος, in the apodosis of the comparison, follows after, and means, not the elements, but the bread from heaven, that is, Christ, as Cyril himself interprets.

[t] The Second Council of Nice (A.D. 787) speaks plainly enough: οὔτε ὁ Κύριος οὔτε οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἡ πατέρες, εἰκόνα εἶπον τὴν διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως προσφερομένην ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα. Concil. Nicaen. ii. Act. vi. pp. 370, 371. So also had Damascen before, tom. i. p. 272. So likewise Ambrosiaster, of the same century, [vid. Oudin. tom. i. p. 1858], in these words:

'Offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, rationabilem hostiam, incruentam hostiam, hunc panem sanctum, et calicem vitae aeternae.' Pseud-Ambros. serm. v. In Oudin. tom. i. 1904. So the interpolated Sacramentary of Greg. I., and so other late liturgies.

[u] See Sacramental Part of the Eucharist Explained, in the preceding Charge, pp. 497–514.

unbloody sacrifice in so particular a manner, as if I thought that much depended upon it: for had the Fathers really denominated the elements by that name, it would amount only to this, that as the elements, by a metonymy, have been sometimes called tremendous sacrifice, often body and blood, or Christ slain, and the like; so, by the same metonymy, they have been likewise called unbloody sacrifice. But as the fact has not been proved, that the elements were ever so named by the ancient Fathers, I thought it proper first to consider the fact, and to give what light I could to it, because it may be of some use to know how the ancients understood and applied their terms or phrases.

VII.

There was another ancient distinction similar to the former, though of somewhat less note; and that was the distinction of smoky and unsmoky sacrifice. The Jewish and Pagan sacrifices were of the smoky, fiery kind; but the Gospel sacrifices were free from fumes and vapours, and inflamed only with the fire of the Holy Spirit. It will be of use carefully to examine this distinction, on two accounts: first, in order to observe whether the Fathers opposed to the smoky sacrifices, which they rejected, clean bread and wine, or clean life; and, next, to see whether that fire of the Spirit, which they supposed to fall upon the Christian sacrifice, was conceived to come upon the eucharistical elements or upon the communicants. By these two marks, we may as easily and as certainly discern what was or what was not the Christian sacrifice, in their estimation, as a tree is known by its fruits, or a face by its lines and features.

1. Let us see then, first, how the Fathers expressed the distinction, and what it was that they opposed to the smoky sacrifices of Jews and Pagans.

Justin, according to his way of stating the Christian sacrifice, in opposition to incensings, among other articles, opposes only the sacrifice of praise [v]. Athenagoras does the like [w]. Irenaeus

[v] Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 19. See above, p. 556, and Review, above, p. 317, &c.

[w] Athenag. pp. 48, 49. See above p. 560. Review, above, p. 323.

opposes a contrite heart, and prayers [x], upon the strength of St. John's authority in the Revelations [y]. Clemens of Alexandria opposes to incensings, &c. a sacrifice of the heart, and of speech exhaled from holy souls, and the like [z]. Tertullian opposes clean prayers [a]. So does Origen [b]. Lactantius opposes to blood, fumes, and libations, a good mind, a clean breast, and innocent life [c]. Hitherto no one thought of opposing clean bread or pure wine to the smoky sacrifices.

Eusebius, speaking of Constantine, says; 'To God, the king of all, he sent up gratulatory prayers, being a kind of unfiery and unsmoky sacrifices [d].' Elsewhere to blood, smoke, and nidor, he opposes purity of thought, sincerity of affection, soundness of principles, and the like [e]. The author of some commentaries under the name of Ambrose, who is supposed to have collected much from Chrysostom, opposes faith and prayers to the smoky sacrifices [f]. Now, if the eucharistical elements had been the Christian sacrifice, how easy and how natural must it have been for the Fathers to flourish upon that topic; the cleanness, the pureness, the usefulness of bread and wine, or the intrinsic value of it, (as some have done since, [g]) beyond all the gold and silver of the Indies. Indeed, how could they miss of it? Or how could they forbear to employ their finest strokes of oratory upon it? Yet they were totally silent on that head.

[x] Irenaeus, lib. iv. c. 17. pp. 248, 249. ed. Bened. See Review, above, p. 324, &c.

[y] Revel. v. 8.

[z] Clem. Alex. Paedag. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 306. Strom. ii. pp. 369, 370. Strom. vii. p. 848. Compare Review, above, p. 328.

[a] Tertull. Apol. c. xxx. p. 277. Ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. See above, p. 561, and Review, above, pp. 329, 330.

[b] Origen. contr. Cels. p. 755. See Review, above, p. 333.

[c] 'Illic nihil exigitur aliud quam sanguis pecudum, et fumus, et inepta libatio: hic bona mens, purum pectus, innocens vita.' Lactant. Instit. lib. v. c. 19. p. 279.

[d] Τῷ πάντων βασιλεῖ Θεῷ εὐχαρίστους εὐχὰς, ὥσπέρ τινας ἀπύρους καὶ ἀκάπνους θυσίας ἀνεπέμπετο. Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. i. c. 48. p 526.

[e] Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 6. p. 23; c. 8. p. 29; c. 10. p. 40. See Review, above, p. 340.

[f] 'Nonne altare est caeleste fides nostra, in quo offerimus quotidie orationes nostras, nihil habens carnalis sacrificii quod in cineres resolvatur, nec in fumos extenuetur, nec in vaporationes diffundatur.' Pseud-Ambros. in Heb. viii.

[g] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part ii. p. 62. Compare my Appendix above, p. 450.

Say, that their 'disciplina arcani' in some measure restrained them from exposing their mysteries to strangers and aliens: yet that 'disciplina' scarcely commenced so soon as some of these authorities [h]. Besides that, their mysteries were not unknown to Julian, for instance, (who had been a Christian reader,) nor to several other adversaries: and they would not have been silent, whatever the Christians themselves were. Yet Julian charged not the Christians with bread-sacrifice, but with no sacrifice [i], (excepting Christ's,) and so the general charge used to run [j]. I know but one instance, and that as late as the fifth century, which looks at all like a charge of bread-sacrifice upon Christians: and perhaps by that time there might be more colour for it (though colour only hitherto) than there had formerly been. It is the instance of Benjamin the Jew, mentioned in Isidore, who objected, that the Church's oblation appeared new and strange, with respect to bread's receiving a sanctification, considering that the law had prescribed bloody sacrifices. Isidore makes a very obscure reply, telling the Jew, that the law had prescribed blood and nidors, in the court of the temple without, but that within there was a table of bread, (meaning the shew-bread,) which was not exposed to the view of the ancient people [k]. It does not appear from this passage, either that Isidore admitted the bread for a sacrifice, or that Benjamin the Jew (who speaks only of bread's being a sanctified offering) charged him with it. But suppose it related to the name of sacrifice, as sometimes

[h] Vid. Tentzelii Exercitationes: contr. Schelstrat. part ii. p. 32, &c. Deylingius, Observat. Miscellan. pp. 407, 408. Dallaeus De Cult. Relig. pp. 1085, 1113. Calvoer de Rit. p. 639.

[i] Vid. Cyrill. Alex. contr. Jul. lib. ix. pp. 307, 308. lib. x. p. 345. edit. Spanhem.

[j] Justin. pp. 14, 19, 387, ed. Lond. Athenag. pp. 48, 49. Clem. Alex. pp. 306, 369, 370, 688, 836, 848, 860, Minuc. Fel. sect. 32. p. 183. Tertull. Apol. 277. Ad Scap. c. ii. p. 69. Origen. contr. Cels. lib. viii. p. 755. ed. Bened. Arnobius, lib. vi. p. 189. Lactantius, Instit. lib. v. c. 19. Epit. pp. 169, 204. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. x.

[k] *Καινὴν καὶ ξένην τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔφης προσφορὰν ἐπινενοῆσθαι, ἐπειδὰν ἄρτος τὸν ἁγιασμὸν ἐνεπιστεύθη, τοῦ νόμου αἵμασι τὰς θυσίας ὁρίζοντος. Πῶς δὲ οὐ συνορᾷς . . . ὅτι τὰ αἵματα καὶ τὰς κνίσσας ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ καὶ τοῖς προσκηνίοις τοῦ ἁγιάσματος νόμος ἐκέλευσε γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἄρτους ἡ ἔσω ἐνεδέχετο τράπεζα, ἡ τῷ παλαίῳ ἀθέατος λαῷ· ὧν εἷς ὑπάρχει αὐτὸς, ὁ τὴν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κρυπτομένην καὶ νῦν δεδηλωμένην ἀλήθειαν μὴ γνούς.* Isidor. Pelus. lib. i. Ep. 401. p. 104, alias 92.

given to the elements in a passive view, (metonymically called sacrifice, as representing and exhibiting the grand sacrifice received or participated in the Eucharist,) it would not concern the question about the active sacrifices performed in the Eucharist, but the sacrifice received in it, symbolically received; and so the instance would be foreign to the point now in hand[1]. I shall have occasion to say more of the elements, as denominated a sacrifice, in the receptive way, and in a metonymical sense, as I go on, and therefore may pass it over now.

2. Having observed what kind of Christian sacrifices were constantly opposed to the smoky and fiery sacrifices of Jews and Pagans, (not pure and clean bread or wine, but pure heart and life,) I am next to take notice what kind of fire the Christians acknowledged in their sacrifice, and how they interpreted it. As Pagans boasted of their culinary fires, which consumed their sacrifices, Christians, in their turn, spake as highly of the fire of the Spirit: let us now see in what manner they managed that topic.

Clemens of Alexandria, opposing the fire of the Spirit to the gross culinary fires, observes, that that spiritual fire does not sanctify the flesh (of animals), but sinful souls[m]. The souls were the sacrifice in his account. Upon the material scheme, had it been his, he must have said, that the fire does not sanctify animal flesh, but bread and wine.

Origen supposes every man to have his burnt sacrifice in himself, offered from the altar of his heart, which altar he

[1] I may just take notice of another instance, sometimes pretended out of Origen; as if he had opposed an offering to God of bread to the sacrifices which Pagans offered to daemons. See the passage in Review, above, p. 86. The strength of the objection lies only in a false rendering of that passage in Origen: the material words, justly rendered, run thus: 'We eat the loaves brought, with thanksgiving and prayer over the things given.' Bellarmine would translate προσαγομένους ἄρτους, 'loaves offered,' understanding them as offered to God: whereupon Albertine makes this reflection:

'Quod Bellarminus ambigue vertit oblatos, et de oblatione Deo facta intelligit, id partim ex linguae Graecae ignorantia, partim ex praejudicio inepte supponit.' Albertin. p. 362.

[m] Φαμὲν δ' ἡμεῖς ἁγιάζειν τὸ πῦρ, οὐ τὰ κρέα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ψυχάς. Πῦρ οὐ παμφάγον καὶ βάναυσον, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρόνιμον λέγοντες, τὸ διϊκνούμενον διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς διερχομένης [f. δεχομένης] τὸ πῦρ. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 851.

himself fires, and keeps always burning [n]: that is to say, by the fire of the Spirit within, not by any fire from without, as in the case of the Jewish and Pagan burnt offerings.

Jerome represents the man, his thoughts, words, and works sublimated, in a manner, by the fire of the Spirit, and, as it were, spiritualized into an heavenly composition, so as to become a most acceptable sacrifice unto God [o]. The persons themselves, by his account are the sacrifice; and upon them the fire of the Spirit falls: whereas, had the elements been supposed the sacrifice, the fire must have fallen there, and the whole turn of the comparison must have been differently contrived. Austin's accounts are much the same with Jerome's, while he supposes the old man to become in a manner extinct, and the sacrifice of the new man to be lighted up by the fire of the Spirit [p].

The most eloquent Chrysostom frequently flourishes upon the same topic. In one place, elegantly describing the nature and excellency of self-sacrifice, he proceeds to speak of the fire which comes upon it, as being of a very new and uncommon kind, such as subsists not upon wood, or material fuel, but is self-subsisting, lives of itself, and gives life to the sacrifice, instead of consuming it [q]. Most certainly he thought not of the material elements:

[n] 'Unusquisque nostrûm habet in se holocaustum suum, et holocausti ipse succendit altare, ut semper ardeat.' Origen. in Levit. Hom. ix. p. 243.

[o] 'Ut corpus pinguis literae, quod significatur in lege, et prophetae nubilum igne Domini, hoc est, Spiritu Sancto (de quo dicit Paulus, Spiritu ferventes) in spiritualem et tenuem substantiam convertantur. . . . Ut per ignem Spiritus Sancti omnia quae cogitamus, loquimur, et facimus, in spiritualem substantiam convertantur, et hujuscemodi Dominus delectatus sacrificiis placabilis fiat.' Hieronym. in Ezech. xliv. pp. 1021, 1022.

[p] 'Extincto vel infirmato per poenitentiam vetere homine, sacrificium justitiae, secundum regenerationem novi hominis, offeratur Deo; cum se offert ipsa anima jam abluta, et imponit in altare fidei, divino igne, id est, Spiritu Sancto, comprehendenda.' Augustin. in Psal. iv. p. 14. tom. iv. Cp. tom. v. pp. 973, 976, and Gaudentius Brix. de Exod. ii. p. 807.

'Totos nos divinus ignis absumat, et fervor ille totos arripiat. Quis fervor? De quo dicit Apostolus, Spiritu ferventes. Non tantum anima nostra absumatur ab illo divino igne sapientiae, sed et corpus nostrum, ut mereatur ibi immortalitatem. Sic levetur holocaustum ut absorbeatur mors in victoriam.' Augustin. in Psal. l. p. 474.

[q] Καινὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῆς θυσίας ὁ νόμος· διὸ καὶ παράδοξος τοῦ πυρὸς ὁ τρόπος. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ξύλων δεῖται καὶ ὕλης ὑποκειμένης, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ζῇ τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἡμέτερον, καὶ οὐδὲ κατακαίει τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸ ζωοποιεῖ. Chrysostom. in Rom.

for he excludes all such gross fuel; neither were the elements capable of receiving life by the fire of the Spirit. Cyril of Alexandria reasons on this head exactly the same way, mysticizing the fire, and appropriating it to the persons considered as the sacrifice[r]. What the Fathers aimed at in all was, to point out something in the Christian sacrifices correspondent or analogous to the ordinary sacrificial fires of the Pagans, and to the holy fire of the Jews, but yet far exceeding both, in purity, dignity, and energy.

But perhaps in may be here asked, Do not the same Fathers often speak of the Holy Spirit's coming upon the eucharistical elements, as well as upon the persons of the communicants? It is very certain that they do; for they supposed the Holy Ghost to consecrate, or sanctify, the elements into holy signs, or sacred symbols, representative and exhibitive of the body and blood of Christ: not to make holocausts or sacrifices of them, but sacraments only[s]; signs of the grand sacrifice, spiritually given and received in and through them. Therefore the Fathers do not speak of the fire of the Spirit, as inflaming or warming the elements; neither could they with any propriety or aptness do it: if there be any chance expression seeming to look that way[t], it can be understood only of the gift of the Spirit accompanying the elements to every worthy communicant. Upon the whole, it is manifest, that when the Fathers opposed their sacrificial fire (viz. the fire of the Spirit) to the sacrificial fires of Jews and Pagans, they supposed it to enlighten, inflame, and spiritualize, not the elements, but the persons: therefore the persons were

Hom. xx. p. 657. tom. ix. Cp. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. p. 383. tom. i. Item de Poenitent. Hom. ix. p. 349. tom. ii. Item de Beat. Philogon. Hom. vi. p. 500. tom. i., et in Heb. Hom. xi. pp. 115, 116. tom. xii. Item, tom. i. pp. 648, 671.

[r] Cyrill. Alex. contra Jul. lib. x. p. 345. Compare my Review, above, p. 346.

[s] See Sacramental Part of the Eucharist Explained in the preceding Charge, p. 491, &c.

[t] There is a passage of Ephrem Syrus, which has been thought to contain some such meaning: 'Christus Salvator noster ignem et spiritum manducandum atque bibendum praestitit nobis carne vestitis, corpus videlicet et sanguinem suum.' Ephr. Syrus, de Natura Dei Incomprehensibili, p. 682. But 'ignis' there seems to mean the Logos, received with the Spirit; received, not by the elements, but by the persons upon their partaking of the elements. Vid. Albertin. pp. 453, 454. The same is received in Baptism also.

the true and acceptable sacrifices, living sacrifices, burning and shining holocausts.

VIII.

There was another ancient, but less noted, distinction of sacrifice, into false and true; or into untrue and true, which amounts to the same.

Philastrius, speaking of the Jewish sacrifices, observes, that they were not perpetual, nor true, nor salutary[u]. That is to say, that though they had truth of propriety, and were, properly speaking, sacrifices, yet they had not truth of excellency, as the Christian sacrifices have. Justin Martyr, long before, had hinted the same thought[v]. And so also had Lactantius in opposing the true sacrifices of Christians to the false ones (though he does not expressly so call them) of Jews and Pagans[x]. St. Austin expresses the distinction of false and true in plain terms; opposing the true Christian sacrifice, performed in the Eucharist, to all the false sacrifices of the aliens[y]. The context may perhaps make it somewhat doubtful, whether true sacrifice in that place refers to the grand sacrifice, or to the eucharistical sacrifice, since they are both of them mentioned in the same chapter. But I choose to refer the words to the nearer, rather than to the more remote antecedent, as most natural, and therefore most probable: and the commendation there given to the true sacrifice, by way of preference, runs no higher than what he elsewhere says of the sacrifice of the Church, offered in the Eucharist. That sacrifice Austin prefers[z], under the name of 'true,' before the false sacrifices both of Jews and Pagans.

I may just note by the way, that there is another sense of false sacrifice to be met with in Cyprian, which belongs not to this place; for he understood schismatical sacrifices; which he calls false and sacrilegious sacrifices, as offered in opposition to

[u] 'Necessitate indocilitatis cogente, sacrificia temporalia, non perpetua, nec vera fuerunt indicta Judaeis, nec salutaria.' Philastr. Haer. cix. p. 221.

[v] Just. Mart. Dial. p. 389.

[x] Lactant. Epit. pp. 169, 204, 205.

[y] 'Huic summo veroque sacrificio cuncta sacrificia falsa cesserunt.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. c. 20. p. 256. Compare my Review, above, p. 347.

[z] 'Hujus autem praeclarissimum atque optimum sacrificium non ipsi sumus: hoc est civitas ejus: cujus rei mysterium celebramus oblationi-

the true pastors[a]. The Jewish and Pagan sacrifices were denominated false, in such a sense as we speak of a false diamond, or false money, meaning counterfeit, figure, imitation: schismatical sacrifices are called false in such a sense as we say a false title, a false patent, or the like. But enough of this.

IX.

Hitherto I have been considering such names of distinction as served to discriminate the Christian sacrifices from the sacrifices both of Jews and Pagans. I proceed next to some other distinctions which respected only the Jewish sacrifices as opposed to the sacrifices of the Gospel. Hereto belongs the distinction between old and new; which we meet with first in Irenaeus of the second century[b]: who appears to understand the new oblation of the offices of piety and benevolence performed at the Christian altar[c]. The sum of his doctrine is, that the old sacrifices which the law required, and which even then had the second place only, have now under the Gospel no place at all; and that the true sacrifices which then had the first place, have now the sole place under a new form, with many new and great improvements. The service, not the elements, are with him the new oblation[d].

bus nostris. Cessaturas enim victimas, quas in umbra futuri offerebant Judaei: et unum sacrificium Gentes a solis ortu usque ad occasum, sicut jam fieri cernimus oblaturas, per Prophetas oracula increpuere divina.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xix. cap. 23. tom. vii.

'Unde et in ipso verissimo et singulari sacrificio, Domino Deo nostro agere gratias admonemur.' Augustin. de Spir. et Lit. c. 11. p. 94. tom. x. Cp. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. c. 6. p. 243. tom. vii. Et contr. Advers. Leg. lib. i. c. 18. p. 568. tom. viii.

[a] 'Dominicae hostiae veritatem per falsa sacrificia profanare.' Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. 'Sacrilega contra verum sacerdotem sacrificia offerre.' Cyprian. Ep. 69.

[b] 'Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis praestat, primitias suorum munerum in Novo Testamento.' Iren. lib. iv. c. 17. p. 249. Compare my Review, above, pp. 324–326.

[c] The following words of Origen are a good comment upon what is said by Irenaeus:

'Si quis vel egentibus distribuat, vel faciat aliquid boni operis pro mandato, munus obtulit Deo.' Origen. in Num. Hom. xi. p. 311. Compare Review, above, pp. 324, 325.

[d] Irenaeus hath plainly said, 'Deus in se assumit bonas operationes nostras.' Iren. lib. iv. c. 18. p. 251. But where hath he said, 'Deus in se assumit panem nostrum et vinum nostrum,' or 'pecuniam nostram?' Nowhere.

Cyprian, after Irenaeus, has the same distinction, under the terms of 'old' and 'new;' observing, that by the accounts given in the Old Testament, the old sacrifice was to be abolished to make way for the new [e]. He refers to Psalm l. 13, 23; Isaiah i. 11, iv. 6; Mal. i. 10. Not that every text there cited directly asserted so much; for at the same time that the prophets spake slightly of the old sacrifices, in comparison, yet God required a religious observance of them: but since those sacrifices were so slightly spoken of, even while their use and obligation remained, that single consideration was sufficient to intimate, that they were to cease entirely under a more perfect dispensation. So the Fathers understood that matter; and therefore those texts out of the Psalms, and out of the Prophet Isaiah, with others of like kind, were not foreign, but were conclusive and pertinent, with respect to the purpose for which they were cited. They did not only prove that the new were then comparatively better than the old, but that a new and better dispensation should admit of no other [f] but the best. This I hint, to prevent any one's imagining, because material sacrifices obtained along with spiritual then, though the spiritual were preferred, that therefore so it may be now, under the last and most perfect economy, where the circumstances are widely different. But I return.

Cyprian, among the new sacrifices, reckons the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of righteousness, spiritual incense, that is, prayers, and the pure offering, whatever it means [g].

Eusebius mentions the new mysteries of the New Testament, contained in the unbloody and rational sacrifices [h]. From

[e] Quod sacrificium vetus evacuaretur, et novum celebraretur.' Cypriam. Testim. lib. i. c. 16.

[f] 'Prayer and sacrifice, strictly so called, were both acts of worship; but prayer more excellent than sacrifice, because sacrifice was a rite of prayer, and a rite which God required no longer than till that most precious sacrifice of the Son of God was offered for us: the merit of which alone it is, that made the prayers of good men in all ages acceptable.' Claget on the Worship of the Blessed Virgin, vol. ii. p. 189. fol. edit.

[g] See the meaning of the pure offering, mentioned in Malachi, explained by Tertullian and Eusebius, cited in Review, above, pp. 330, 340.

[h] Ἐνὶ δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ μόνῳ θυσιαστήριον ἀναίμων καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν κατὰ καινὰ μυστήρια τῆς νέας καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης. Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 6. p. 20. Θύομεν καινῶς, κατὰ τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην. Ibid. cap. 10. He explains the meaning of new, lib. i. c. 6. p. 16.

whence appears the vanity of arguing, (as some have done[i]), that the new sacrifice, spoken of by the Fathers, could not mean spiritual sacrifice, which had obtained long before: for it is certain fact, that the Fathers did so understand and so apply the name of new sacrifice; and therefore it is reasoning against fact, or disputing against the Fathers themselves, to argue in that way. Besides that the argument may very easily be retorted, since neither material sacrifice, nor bread sacrifice, nor wine sacrifice, could be reckoned altogether new: for they obtained under the old, that is, under the Jewish economy[k]. In one sense, indeed, they are new, (which is no commendation of them,) they are new Christianity, having been unknown in the Church for six whole centuries or more, and not brought in before the late and dark ages: probably, about the time when material incense came in, under the notion of a Christian sacrifice[l]. But of this I may say more in another article below. I shall only add here, that St. Austin called the cross-sacrifice, Christ's body and blood, as participated, the new sacrifice[m].

X.

I proceed to another distinction, as considerable as any before mentioned; and that is of legal or literal, and spiritual or evangelical. Indeed, the word spiritual may, and sometimes has been, opposed to material or corporeal; and so far the distinction would resolve into article the fifth, before considered under the names of material and immaterial: but here I consider the name of spiritual under another conception, as opposed to literal

[i] Bellarmin. de Eucharist. pp. 749, 751. Compare Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 268, 269.

That pretence has been often answered by learned Protestants, Pet. Martyr contr. Gardin. p. 54. Jewel against Hard. p. 421. Bilson, p. 696. Hospinian, p. 568. Chrastovius de Missa, lib. i. p. 57. Mason, 585. Du Moulin. Buckl. 432. Rivet. Cathol. 106. Buddaeus, Miscel. Sacr. tom. i. p. 54. Deylingius, Miscell. Sacr. pp. 98, 99.

[k] Exod. xxix. 40; v. 11, 12, 13. Levit. ii. 4, &c. Numb. xxvii. 13, 14. Compare Brevint on the Mass, pp. 116, 121. Kidder, p. 93, new edit. fol.

[l] See Christian Sacrifice Explained, Appendix, p. 450. Compare Dodwell on Incensing, p. 222. Claget on the Worship of the Blessed Virgin, p. 188. vol. ii. in fol.

[m] 'Ut jam de cruce commendaretur nobis caro et sanguis Domini, novum sacrificium.' Augustin. in Psalm. xxxiii. p. 211. tom. iv. ed. Bened.

and legal. The New Testament itself often distinguishes between the letter and the spirit [n], that is, between the Law, which is the outward shell, and the Gospel, the inward kernel. This distinction may be otherwise expressed by the words carnal and spiritual: for the word flesh is frequently a Scripture name for the external and legal economy [o], as opposed to the spirit, which is the name for the Gospel, as before hinted. Earthly and spiritual mean the same with the other [p]. Typical and true is but another way of wording the same distinction [q] between legal and evangelical, as the Law was a type or prefiguration of Gospel-blessings, and as figure is opposed to truth.

Symbolical and true differs from the other, only as a type differs from a symbol, or as a particular from a general: for a type, strictly, is a figure of things future, as before noted; whereas a symbol is a figure of things past, present, or to come. So that both are figures, and as such are opposed to truth, like as shadows to substance. In short, the Jewish sacrifices were comparatively literal, carnal, terrene, typical, symbolical; and the Christian sacrifices are spiritual and true: such is the import of the present distinction, variously expressed in Scripture or in Church writers.

St. Peter uses the name of spiritual sacrifice [r], in such a sense as spirit and truth are opposed to type, figure, shadow, symbol, or emblem: for he understood it in the same way as he understood the Church to be a spiritual house, and the Jewish temple to have been an emblem or figure of it. So much appears from St. Peter's context. The Fathers took their hints from the Apostle: and their notion of spiritual sacrifice appears conformable thereto, as being regulated by it, and copied from it; only

[n] Rom. ii. 29; vii. 6; viii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 6. Compare Christian Sacrifice Explained, p. 416, and Glassius's Philolog. Sacr. p. 1427.

[o] Rom. iv. 1. 2 Cor. v. 16. Gal. iii. 3; iv. 23, 29. Philipp. iii. 4. Heb. vii. 16. Tertullian expresses the distinction by the words 'carnalia et spiritalia.' Adv. Jud. cap. v. p. 188. So also Jerome on Malachi; and probably some others.

[p] Tertullian uses the distinction of 'terrene' and 'spiritual.'

[q] Irenaeus particularly uses the distinction of 'typical' and 'true,' lib. iv. cap. 17. Note, that the truth of a thing, in Scripture phrase, means the true interpretation of it. Dan. vii. 16.

[r] 1 Pet. ii. 5.

taking in St. Paul's account of reasonable service[s], and our Lord's own rule of worship 'in spirit and in truth[t],' and the several other descriptions given in the New Testament of evangelical sacrifice. There were two things pointed to by the legal sacrifices; our Lord's sacrifice, and ours; his propitiating merits, our qualifying duties or services. The truth of this matter may best appear by a distinct enumeration of particulars, as follows:—

1. The legal incense pointed to the perfume of Christ's mediation[u], and at the same time to the prayers of the saints[v]. In these it centered, in these it terminated: and thus the material incense is now spiritualized into the evangelical sacrifice of prayer.

2. The blood of the ancient sacrifices typically referred to the blood of Christ; which none can dispute: but it seems withal, that it symbolically referred to the blood of martyrs, who sacrifice their lives unto God[x].

3. The mincha of the Old Testament had a typical aspect to Christ, as all the sacrifices had: but it seems likewise to have had a symbolical aspect to the oblation of Christ's mystical body, the Church[y].

4. The daily sacrifice looked principally to our Lord's continual intercession: but it appears to have been likewise a kind of emblem or symbol of Christian faith and service[z].

5. The Levitical memorial typified the sweet odour[a] of Christ: but in symbolical construction it seems also to have pointed to prayers and benevolent works[b].

6. Sacrifices in general, typically looking to Christ, are symbolically interpreted of almsdeeds[c].

[s] Rom. xii. 1. [t] John iv. 24.

[u] Revel. viii. 3, 4. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Wolfius in loc. Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 1260. Outram, p. 359.

[v] Revel. v. 8. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Dodwell on Incensing, p. 36, &c. Outram, p. 357.

[x] Revel. vi. 9. Vid. Vitringa in loc. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. pp. 536–561. Biblioth. Antiq. tom. i. p. 505. Outram, p. 181.

[y] Rom. xv. 16. Vid. Vitringa in Isa. lxvi. 20. p. 950.

[z] Philipp. ii. 17. Vid. Vitringa de vet. Synagog. l. i. c. 6. pp. 70, 71. Wolfius in loc. Cp. Rom. xii. 1.

[a] Ephes. v. 2. Cp. Deylingius's Observ. Sacr. tom. i. p. 315.

[b] Acts x. 4. Phil. iv. 18.

[c] Heb. xiii. 16. Vid. Wolfius in loc.

7. The animal sacrifices of the old law, pointing to the grand sacrifice, appear to have had a secondary, symbolical aspect to the calves of the lips [d].

8. Libations of wine, typifying the blood of Christ, are represented as emblems of pouring forth one's blood in martyrdom [e].

9. Lastly, the mactation of animals for sacrifice is interpreted of mortifying our lusts and passions [f].

Thus has the new Testament itself unfolded the mystical intendment of the Law; giving us the spirit instead of the letter, truth for figure, and, in the room of the antiquated signs, the things themselves signified by them. Upon this principle, the Fathers of the Church constantly believed and taught, that the legal sacrifices were not barely typical of the sacrifice of the cross, but were signs also and symbols of the evangelical sacrifices offered up by Christians [g]; and were to be considered as semblages to realities, or as shadows to substance, or as flesh to spirit. It remains only, that we inquire what they understood the spiritual sacrifice to be; for as to the legal sacrifices, every one knows what they were, being so particularly set forth, and so minutely described in the Old Testament, and referred to also in the New.

Now as to the spiritual sacrifices, besides what is said of them in both Testaments [h], the Fathers have so plainly deciphered them, and so distinctly enumerated them, that there can be no reasonable question made as to what sacrifices they intended by that name. I have elsewhere traced this matter from Father to Father, through the first four centuries [i], and I need not repeat

[d] Hosea xiv. 2. Heb. xiii. 15.

[e] Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 6. Cp. Deyling. Observat. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 547, &c. Zornius, Opusc. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 48, &c.

[f] Rom. vi. 6. Coloss. iii. 5. See Dodwell on Incense, p. 34, and Cranmer against Gardiner, p. 109, alias pp. 422, 423.

[g] Irenaeus, lib. iv. c. 7. ed. Bened. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. p. 849, ed. Oxon. Origen. in Levit. Hom. ii. p. 191. edit. Bened. Nazianz. Orat. xxxviii. p. 484. Chrysostom. in Heb. Hom. xi. pp. 807, 808. Augustin. tom. vii. pp. 241, 242, 255; viii. 345, 586; x. 94. Pseud-Ambros. in Heb. viii. p. 447.

[h] See my Review, above, pp. 311, 312.

[i] Ibid. pp. 314–386.

here: only I may add two or three authorities to the many before cited, for confirmation.

Origen is very full and express in his accounts of spiritual sacrifice [k]. Chrysostom is so minute and particular in specifying what the spiritual sacrifices are, that nothing can be more so [l]. He does it by giving in a catalogue of Christian virtues or graces: those are the spiritual sacrifices, in his estimation. When he says, they need no instruments, nor are confined to place, he is to be understood of the virtuous habits resting in the mind, and which, if all opportunities of outward exercise were wanting, would still be spiritual sacrifices; so that they do not absolutely need instrument or place, as material sacrifices do. And when they do need both, as to the outward exercise of those virtues or religious habits, still it is the inward heart, rather than the outward work, which is properly the acceptable sacrifice. Such is Chrysostom's account of this matter, and such the concurring sentiments of all antiquity. Great pains have been taken [m] to find, if it were possible, some ancient voucher for a different account of spiritual sacrifice, or for some different application of that name: but not a single instance has been found, nor, I suppose, ever will be.

Bellarmine pretended [n] that Tertullian understood Abel's sacrifice of a sheep to have been a spiritual sacrifice. All invention and misconstruction. Tertullian did not, could not suppose so wild a thing; which would have been a flat contradiction to his known, certain, settled principles everywhere else in his works [o],

[k] 'Immolatio spiritalis est illa quam legimus, Immola Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua.' Psal. l. 14. 'Laudare ergo Deum, et vota orationis offerre, immolare est Deo.' Origen. in Num. Hom. xi. p. 311. tom. ii. ed. Bened.: cp. pp. 191, 205, 248, 363, 418, 563.

[l] Τί δέ ἐστιν ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία; τὰ διὰ ψυχῆς, τὰ διὰ πνεύματος. Joan. iv. 24. Ὅσα μὴ δεῖται σώματος, ὅσα μὴ δεῖται ὀργάνων, μὴ τόπων. Τὰ δέ ἐστιν ἐπιείκεια, σωφροσύνη, ἐλεημοσύνη, ἀνεξικακία, μακροθυμία, ταπεινοφροσύνη. Chrysostom. in Heb. Hom. xi. p. 115. tom. xii.

Τί δέ ἐστι λογικὴ λατρεία; ἡ πνευματικὴ διακονία, ἡ πολιτεία ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν . . . . ταῦτα γὰρ ποιῶν, ἀναφέρεις λογικὴν λατρείαν. Τουτέστιν, οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν. Chrysost. in Rom. Hom. xx. p. 658. tom. ix.

[m] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 22–27, 61.

[n] Bellarmin. de Eucharist, p. 751. Compare Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 25.

[o] See some of the passages collected in Review, above, pp. 329–332.

and in that very work also which Bellarmine referred to, Tertullian does not say that Abel's sacrifice was a spiritual sacrifice, but that Cain, the elder brother, was a type or prefiguration of the elder people Israel, and Abel a type or prefiguration of the younger people, the Christian Church; and that as their sacrifices were different, (one being of the fruits of the ground, the other of the flock,) so a difference in the sacrifices of the two different people was thereby intimated [p]. Not precisely the same difference, but a difference: and as to the kind of difference, Tertullian sufficiently explains it afterwards, when, to the terrene sacrifices of the elder people, the Jews, he opposes the spiritual sacrifices of the younger people, the Christians, and specifies what they are; namely, the sacrifices of lauds, and of a contrite heart [q]. But some may ask, how then did Tertullian make out what he pretended? He made it out thus: that the Jewish and Christian sacrifices would be different, like as Cain's and Abel's were, and that one should be rejected, and the other accepted by God: so far the analogy or similitude holds, and no further. For if we were to strain it with the utmost rigour, the Jewish sacrifices ought all to have been of the fruits of the ground, which is false in fact; and the Christian sacrifices ought to be animal sacrifices, which is manifestly absurd. In short, as Tertullian has not said, nor could consistently say, that Abel's sacrifice was a spiritual sacrifice; so neither can it, by any clear or just consequence, be concluded that he meant it, or had any thought of it. But it is further pleaded, that material things have sometimes the epithet of spiritual or rational superadded;

[p] 'Sic et sacrificia terrenarum oblationum et spiritualium sacrificiorum praedicata ostendimus. Et quidem a primordio majoris filii, id est, Israel terrena fuisse in Cain praeostensa, et minoris filii Abel, id est, populi nostri, sacrificia diversa demonstrata. Namque major natu Cain de fructu terrae obtulit munera Deo, minor vero filius Abel de fructu ovium suarum. Respexit Deus in Abel et in munera ejus, in Cain autem et in munera ejus non respexit. . . . Ex hoc igitur duplicia duorum populorum sacrificia praeostensa jam tunc in primordio animadvertimus.' Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. v. p. 187.

[q] 'Quod non terrenis sacrificiis, sed spiritalibus Deo litandum sit, ita legimus ut scriptum est; Cor contribulatum et humiliatum hostia Deo est: et alibi, Sacrifica Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua. Sic igitur sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur, et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur.' Tertull. ibid. cap. v. p. 188.

and why then may not a material sacrifice be a spiritual or rational sacrifice in a just sense of the word? I answer: the question is not, whether the epithet spiritual may not in a just sense be applied to a material subject; for it is certain that it may, and St. Paul[r] himself more than once so applies it: the question is not, how the single word spiritual may be applied, but what the phrase of spiritual sacrifice, according to Scripture usage, and according to Church usage, signifies. It has not been shewn, that either the New Testament or the ancient Fathers ever gave the name of spiritual sacrifice, either to the elements of the Eucharist, or to any material offerings. Spiritual sacrifice is a phrase of a determined meaning in the New Testament and ancient Church writers; and it is but a vain attempt to look for any real countenance from them, by retaining the phrase, unless the ideas which they affixed to it be retained also: for the doctrine will be different, though the words or phrases should still continue the same.

If it should be suggested, after all, that the carnal, earthly, legal sacrifices meant only such sacrifices as wanted the inward service of the heart, and that spiritual sacrifices meant sacrifices offered from and with the spiritual service of the heart; it is obvious to reply, that then the distinction which we are now upon could not have served the purpose for which it was brought, could not have shewn the absolute preference due to the Christian sacrifices above the Jewish. The Jews, as many as were really good men, joined the sacrifice of the heart with the material offerings: and if that had been all the meaning

[r] 1 Cor. x. 3, 4; xv. 44.

N. B. The word spiritual sometimes means the same with mystical, and may be applied to any material thing considered as a sign of something spiritual. In such a sense, St. Paul speaks of spiritual (that is, mystical) meat, drink, rock. In the like sense, we may, among the Fathers, meet with the phrases of mystical (or spiritual) oil, or waters, or bread, or cup, or supper, or table, meaning a material sign or symbol of something spiritual. Cyprian seems to denote the elements by the name of spiritual and heavenly Sacrament. Epist. lxiii. p. 108. But still the phrase of spiritual sacrifice is not applied to them (so far as appears) among Church writers truly ancient: for in that phrase spiritual denotes not the sign of something else, but the very thing signified, like as in the phrase of spiritual house, parallel to it in the same verse of St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 5).

which the Fathers went upon in their disputes with the Jews, the Jews might have retorted, irresistibly, that their sacrifices were as truly spiritual as the Christian sacrifices could be, and more valuable, as having all that spirituality which the Christians pretended to, and a rich offering besides, of bullocks, suppose, or rams. The Fathers were wiser than to lay themselves open, and to expose the Christian cause, by any such meaning: besides that, their own repeated explications of the phrase of spiritual sacrifice are a flat contradiction to it.

XI.

I pass on to another celebrated distinction of sacrifice, into Aaronical and Mechizedekian; which served also to distinguish the Christian sacrifices from the Jewish ones, but in a view somewhat different from that of the distinction immediately preceding. For as the distinction of literal and spiritual was intended chiefly to set forth the superior excellency of what Christians actively offered by way of sacrifice, so the present distinction of Aaronical and Melchizedekian was intended chiefly to set forth the superior excellency of what Christians passively receive, participate, or feast upon, under the name and notion of a sacrifice.

Christians have an altar, whereof they partake[s]. And that altar is Christ our Lord[t], who is altar, priest, and sacrifice, all in one. Under the law, those were different things, because any one of the legal figures alone could not represent Christ in all the three several capacities: but in him they are all united. He performed his sacrifice in the active and transient sense, once for all, upon the cross: he distributes it daily in the passive and

[s] Heb. xiii. 10. See my Review, above, p. 93, &c. And compare Dallaeus de Cult. Lat. Relig. lib. viii. cap. 24. p. 1117. Patrick, Mens. Myst, p. 85. Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. ii. p. 843. Mason de Minister. Anglic. p. 625.

[t] Revel. viii. 3, 5. Compare my Review, above, p. 324, and Vitringa in loc. with Dodwell on Incensing, pp. 39–44, and Dallaeus de Cult. Lat. Relig. p. 1117.

'Est ergo altare in caelis (illuc enim preces nostrae et oblationes diriguntur) et templum; quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait, et apertum est templum Dei.' Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 249. Cp. Clem. Alex. p. 209. Origen. in Levit. Hom. i. p. 186. In Josh. Hom. xvii. p. 438, and others referred to in Review, above, p. 324.

abiding sense of it, to all his true servants, to every faithful communicant. His table here below is a secondary altar in two views; first, on the score of our own sacrifices of prayers, praises, souls, and bodies, which we offer up from thence [u]; secondly, as it is the seat of the consecrated elements, that is, of the body and blood of Christ [v], that is, of the grand sacrifice, symbolically represented and exhibited, and spiritually there received; received by and with the signs bearing the name of the things.

These things premised, we may now find our way opened towards a right conception of the Melchizedekian sacrifice, whereof we partake in the Eucharist, and which is infinitely preferable to all the sacrifices of Aaron, considered barely as sacrifices: for as to their sacramental capacity, that is of distinct consideration. For the first two centuries and a half, Melchizedek was considered as giving holy food to Abraham, a symbol of the true food from heaven, and a prelude to what our Lord himself should afterwards do in the institution of the Eucharist [x].

About the middle of the third century, Cyprian, considering our Lord's passion as the sacrifice commemorated and participated in the Eucharist, (which is a right notion rightly understood,) expressed that commemorative act by the word offer [y]: by which he could mean only the presenting to view, or repre-

[u] 'It is called a table with reference to the Lord's Supper, and an altar on the score of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving there offered to God Almighty.' King Edward's Letter, A. D. 1550, in Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 304. See Reasons against Altars in 1559, Ibid. p. 433; and compare my Christian Sacrifice Explained, p. 423. Dow's Answer to Burton, p. 116.

[v] 'Quid enim est altare, nisi sedes corporis et sanguinis Christi? Quid vos offenderat Christus, cujus illic per certa momenta corpus et sanguis habitabat... fregistis etiam calices, sanguinis Christi portatores.' Optat. adv. Parmen. lib. vi. p. 289.

In the other sense or view of an altar, the same author says, 'Altaria Dei, et quibus vota populi, in membra Christi portata sunt... Illac ad aures Dei ascendere solebat oratio.' Optat. ibid.

[x] Μελχισεδὲκ, *βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, ὁ Ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἄρτον, τὴν ἁγιασμένην διδοὺς τροφὴν, εἰς τύπον εὐχαριστίας.* Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. p. 632. Cp. Tertullian. adv. Judaeos, cap. iii. p. 185. Contr. Marc. lib. v. p. 472.

[y] 'Passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus: passio est enim Domini sacrificium quod offerimus. Calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis ejus offerimus.' Cyprian, Ep. lxiii. p. 109. 'Calix qui in commemorationem ejus offertur,' p. 104.

senting; as is very evident, since our Lord's passion could be no otherwise offered, neither could the cross sacrifice be reiterated. Christ cannot again be sacrificed, no, not by himself; much less by any one else. From hence it may be perceived in how lax a sense Cyprian used the word offer. Therefore no certain conclusion can be drawn from it, in favour of the strict sacrificial sense of the word, whether he speaks of offering bread and wine[z], or of offering Christ's passion, unless some other circumstances determine the meaning. Cyprian cannot be understood of our Lord's sacrificing himself in the Eucharist, because that would be too high for us to aim at; nor of his sacrificing the elements, because that would have been too low a sacrifice for him, at least, to offer. When he speaks of offering a true and full sacrifice[a], (meaning bread and wine jointly, and not either singly,) he understands that bread and wine (which he calls sacrifice, by the same figure as he often calls them body and blood) to be a true and full representation or image of the sacrifice of the cross. So Cyprian himself explains it, viz. by offering (that is, presenting) an image of Christ's sacrifice in bread and wine[b]. The sum of his doctrine is, that the typical Melchizedek blessed Abraham in and by bread and wine, considered as symbols, images, figurations of our Lord's passion and sacrifice; and that the true Melchizedek so blessed his own disciples in delivering to them

[z] 'Quod Melchizedech sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod panem et vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit.... Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchizedech obtulerat, id est, panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem.' p. 105.

Compare St. Austin on the same head:

'Ipse est etiam sacerdos noster in aeternum, secundum ordinem Melchizedech, qui seipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suae passionis memoriam commendavit; ut illud quod Melchizedech obtulit, Deo jam per totum terrarum orbem in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri.' Augustin. de Divers. Quaest. q. 61. p. 34. tom. vi.

[a] 'Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur; et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesia Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse.' Ep. lxiii. Compare my Review, above, p. 336.

[b] 'Ut ergo in Genesi per Melchizedech sacerdotem benedictio circa Abraham possit rite celebrari, praecedit ante imago sacrificii Christi, in pane et vino scilicet constituta. Quam rem perficiens et adimplens Dominus panem et calicem mixtum vino obtulit, et qui est plenitudo veritatis, veritatem praefiguratae imaginis adimplevit.' p. 105.

the benefits contained in his passion, by the like symbols. We may go on to Eusebius, who explains this matter more clearly, and who, besides, more distinctly expresses the difference between Aaronical and Melchizedekian sacrifices, in these words :—

'As he (Melchizedek), being a priest of the Gentiles, nowhere appears to have used corporeal sacrifices, but blessed Abraham with wine only and bread ; just in the same manner, first our Lord and Saviour himself, and then all priests from him, among all nations, consummating the spiritual hierourgy, according to the laws of the Church, do represent the mysteries of his body and of his salutary blood, in bread and wine. Melchizedek foresaw these (mysteries) by a divine spirit, and previously made use of those images of things to come [c].' Whereupon we may observe, 1. That Melchizedek, by this account, used no corporeal sacrifices : therefore he did not sacrifice bread and wine, which undoubtedly are both corporeal. It is in vain to contend that he meant bloody, as opposed to unbloody. His word is corporeal, not bloody ; and he had used the same word just before, speaking of corporeal oil, in the common sense of corporeal [d]. 2. That the Melchizedekian priests, after our Lord, exercise a spiritual hierourgy, as opposed to corporeal sacrifices before mentioned : therefore their sacrifices are spiritual ; and therefore, again, they sacrifice not bread or wine, but they represent or signify the mysteries of the passion in bread and wine [e] ; they perform a memorial service by those symbols, a direct memorial

[c] Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος Ἱερεὺς ἐθνῶν τυγχανῶν, οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται θυσίαις σωματικαῖς κεχρημένος, οἴνῳ δὲ μόνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ εὐλογῶν· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον πρῶτος μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἔπειτα οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες ἱερεῖς ἀνὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὴν πνευματικὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες, κατὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς, ἱερουργίαν, οἴνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ, τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ σωτηρίου αἵματος αἰνίττονται τὰ μυστήρια, τοῦ Μελχισεδὲκ ταῦτα πνεύματι θείῳ προτεθεωρηκότος, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ταῖς εἰκόσι προκεχρημένου. Euseb. Demonstrat. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 223. Cp. Theodorit. in Psal. cx. p. 852.

[d] Οὐδὲ διὰ σκευαστοῦ καὶ σωματικοῦ ἐλαίου ἐκέχριστο, οὐδὲ τέλος ἔξειν ἔμελλε τῆς ἱεροσύνης. Euseb. ibid. p. 223.

[e] So Epiphanius on this article. Ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ αὐτῷ [Ἀβραὰμ] ἀπήντα, καὶ ἐξέβαλεν αὐτῷ ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον, προτυπῶν τῶν μυστηρίων τὰ αἰνίγματα, ἀντίτυπα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, λέγοντος, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, καὶ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ αἵματος, τοῦ ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ νυχθέντος καὶ ῥεύσαντος εἰς κάθαρσιν τῶν κεκοινωμένων καὶ βαντισμὸν, καὶ σωτηρίαν τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν. Epiphan. Panar. Haer. lv. n. 6. p. 472.

of the grand sacrifice. 3. That Melchizedek, by a divine spirit, foresaw the mysteries of the same grand sacrifice, and made a figuration of it in bread and wine, and by those symbols conveyed a blessing to Abraham [f], the blessing of the great atonement. Herein lay the superior excellency of Melchizedek's sacrifice, (that is, figuration of the grand sacrifice,) that it directly pointed to and exhibited true expiation, while Aaron's directly conveyed temporal blessings only, and a temporal atonement [g]. It must indeed be owned, that true expiation was conveyed under the legal veils to persons fitly qualified: but those legal sacrifices, in their sacrificial capacity, did nothing of that kind. What they did of a saving kind was in their sacramental capacity: for, that they were sacraments, as well as sacrifices, is an allowed principle among knowing Divines of all principles or persuasions [h]. Where then was the difference between the Aaronical sacrifice and Melchizedekian, if both were sacramental conveyances of the same blessings, and if neither of them availed anything in their sacrificial capacity, properly speaking? The difference lay here, that Melchizedek was considered as conveying the true expiation directly and plainly, by the symbols of bread and wine, and not under the dark covers of a legal expiation, which but remotely and obscurely pointed to it. He feasted himself and Abraham directly upon the grand sacrifice itself, as Christian priests do now: Aaron feasted himself and his people directly upon nothing but the legal sacrifices, and the legal, temporal expiations. But this distinction will yet

[f] So Julius Firmicus of that time: 'Melchizedech, rex Salem, et sacerdos summi Dei, revertenti Abrahae, cum pane et vino benedictionis obtulit gratiam.' Bibl. P. P. tom. iv. p. 114. ed. 1618.

[g] This matter is clearly expressed by an author of the twelfth century, under the name of Cyprian:

'Hoc maxime discernere debet Christiana religio, quod sanguis animalium a sanguine Christi per omnia differens, temporalis tantum habeat vivificationis effectum, et vita eorum finem habeat, et sine ulla revocatione terminum constitutum, ideoque ad obtinendam aeternitatem non potest proficere . . . Bibimus autem de sanguine Christi, ipso jubente, vitae aeternae cum ipso et per ipsum participes.' Pseudo-Cyprian. de Coena, p. 113, edit. Bened.

[h] Cudworth on the Sacram. chap. ii. p. 23, &c. Gerhard, tom. iv. pp. 292, 297. Alanus de Eucharist, p. 502. Chamier, tom. iv. pp. 14, 15. Vossius de Idololatr. lib. i. cap. 41. pp. 151, 152. Cloppenburg, Schol. Sacrific. p. 9, &c. Buddaeus, Instit. Theolog, p. 687.

be better understood, by some other passages of the Fathers, which I am going to subjoin in their order.

St. Jerome, more than once, mentions the distinction between the Aaronical and Mechizedekian sacrifices. He declares, in one place, that Melchizedek did not (like Aaron) sacrifice irrational victims, but offered bread and wine, that is, the body and blood of the Lord[i]. He does not say, sacrificed bread and wine, but offered, (a word of some latitude,) and he presently after interprets them by the body and blood. So that Melchizedek, according to him, offered no sacrifice but the grand sacrifice: and he could not properly sacrifice that body and blood, which were not then in being, but he figured it by symbols[k], and therewith conveyed the blessings of it; feasting Abraham, not with legal victims, but with Christ himself. This appears to be his sense of that matter; which will be further confirmed by other passages of the same Father. He gives a kind of summary of the sentiments of Hippolytus, Irenaeus, two Eusebius's, Apollinaris, and Eustathius, in relation to Melchizedek; importing, 'that he sacrificed no victims of flesh and blood, took not the blood of the brute animals upon his right hand; but he dedicated a Sacrament in bread and wine, in the simple and pure sacrifice of Christ[l].' So I point and translate the sentence; altering the common punctuation only as to the placing of a single comma, to make out the sense. As to what he says of not receiving blood on the right hand, (or right thumb,) I suppose it alludes to the Levitical rites of consecration

[i] 'Quod autem ait, Tu es sacerdos in aeternum, secundum ordinem Melchisedech, mysterium nostrum in verbo ordinis significatur, nequaquam per Aaron irrationalibus victimis immolandis, sed oblato pane et vino, id est corpore et sanguine Domini.' Hieron. Quaest. Hebraic. p. 520. tom. ii. ed. Bened.

[k] 'Postquam typicum Pascha fuerat completum, et agni carnes cum Apostolis comederat, assumit panem qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum Paschae transgreditur Sacramentum: ut quomodo in praefiguratione ejus Melchizedech, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repraesentaret.' Hieron. Comment. in Matt. xxvi. p. 128. tom. iv. part 1.

[l] 'Neque carnis et sanguinis victimas immolaverit, et brutorum sanguinem animalium dextra susceperit, sed pane et vino, simplici puroque sacrificio Christi, dedicaverit Sacramentum.' Hieron. Epist. ad Evangel. p. 571. tom. ii.

to the priesthood [m], which Melchizedek had nothing to do with. He received his priesthood in some other way, and he exercised it in a different manner; not by sacrificing animals, but by dedicating or consecrating a Sacrament [n], in or with bread and wine: that is to say, with the simple and pure sacrifice of Christ alone, represented and exhibited by and under those symbols. This appears to be St. Jerome's sense, and his full sense. For like as he had, in a passage before cited, interpreted bread and wine by what they are signs of, namely, by body and blood of the Lord, so here he interprets them by the same thing, under the equivalent expression of the simple and pure sacrifice of Christ. And as he had in a second passage, before cited, interpreted the offering bread and wine of a figuration and representation of the true body and blood, so he may reasonably be presumed to mean the same thing here. He calls the sacrifice of Christ, thus represented, thus exhibited, simple and pure, as not blended with any typical sacrifices or legal expiations, but standing perfectly clear of them, and nakedly viewed in its own simplicity, free from such legal incumbrances: represented, indeed, by symbols, but yet so represented as that the things signified, the body and blood, and the true expiation, are as plainly, as directly offered to every man's faith and understanding, as the signs are to the outward senses, and both are alike spoken of in plain and clear terms. If it was not alto-

[m] Exod. xxix. 20.

[n] 'Recurre ad Genesim, et Melchizedech regem Salem hujus principem invenies civitatis: qui jam tum in typo Christi panem et vinum obtulit, et mysterium Christianum in Salvatoris sanguine et corpore dedicavit.' Hieron. ad Marcell. p. 547. tom. iv. part 2.

N. B. Jerome considered Christ's body and blood as symbolically contained in the exhibitive signs: and no wonder, when in the same Epistle he could write thus: 'Sepulchrum Domini quotiescunque ingredimur, toties jacere in syndone cernimus Salvatorem,' &c.

I interpret the dedicating a Sacrament in or with Christ's body and blood, in such a sense as St. Austin says, 'Mare rubrum . . . passione et sanguine Domini consecratum.' [In Psalm. lxxx.] And, 'Unde rubet Baptismus, nisi Christi sanguine consecratus?' In Joan. Tract. xi. That is to say, the Sacrament of Baptism is made an exhibitive sign of Christ's blood: which is, its consecration, or sanctification, or dedication, to high and holy purposes. The blood signified, and spiritually exhibited, by water in one Sacrament, by wine in the other, gives the holy sanction to both Sacraments: for without that, they would be no Sacraments at all.

gether so in Melchizedek's sacrament, or figurative sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, yet certainly it is in ours: and this consideration renders it vastly preferable to the legal sacrifices; though they also darkly were sacraments of the same things, and were much more valuable in that their sacramental capacity than in any other.

St. Austin often speaks of this matter. He understood the Melchizedekian sacrifice, (as opposed to Aaron's,) of sacrifice passively considered; not as offered to God, in a proper sense, but as exhibited to, and received, or participated by men [o]. The want of observing the difference between a sacrifice considered as actively offered, and as passively received, has made strange confusion in what concerns the Melchizedekian sacrifice, spoken of by the Fathers [p]. Yet this matter was clearly understood, as low as the times of Charles the Great [q], and much lower: and even Thomas Aquinas, of the thirteenth century, has given a just account of it; rightly distinguishing between the oblation of a sacrifice and a participation [r]. To be short, as the sacrifices

[o] 'Quod ergo addidit, manducare panem, etiam ipsum sacrificii genus eleganter expressit. . . . Ipsum est sacrificium, non secundum ordinem Aaron, sed secundum ordinem Melchisedech: qui legit intelligat . . . Quia enim dixerat superius, dedisse se domui Aaron cibos de victimis Veteris Testamenti, ubi ait, Dedi domui patris tui omnia quae sunt ignis, filiorum Israel in escam. Haec quippe fuerunt sacrificia Judaeorum: ideo hic dixit manducare panem; quod est in Novo Testamento sacrificium Christianorum.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xvii. cap. 5. pp. 466, 467. tom. vii. Cp. Ep. 177. p. 626. tom. ii. Et in Psal. xxxiii. pp. 210, 211. tom. iv. In Psal. cvi. p. 1211. In Psal. cix. p. 1241. tom. iv. De Quaest. Octogint. q. lxi. p. 34. tom. vi. De Civit. Dei, lib. xvii. pp. 435, 480. Contr. Advers. Leg. pp. 570, 571. tom. viii.

[p] See my Appendix, above, pp. 462–465, 475.

[q] 'Jam verus Melchisedech, Christus videlicet, rex justus, rex pacis, non pecudum victimas, sed sui nobis corporis et sanguinis contulit Sacramentum.' Carol. Magn. Capit. prolix. lib. iv. cap. 14. p. 520. Cp. Haymo Halberst. In Psal. cix. p. 597. Theodulf. de Ordinat. Baptismi, cap. 18. Anselm [sive Herveus Dolensis] in Heb. v. p. 416, et in Heb. vii. p. 423. Walafrid. Strab. de Reb. Eccl. cap. xvi. p. 674.

[r] 'In sacerdotio Christi duo possunt considerari, scilicet ipsa oblatio Christi, et participatio ejus. Quantum ad ipsam oblationem, expressius figurabat sacerdotium Christi sacrificium legale per sanguinis effusionem, quam sacerdotium Melchisedech, in quo sanguis non effundebatur. Sed quantum ad participationem hujus sacrificii et ejus effectum, expressius praefigurabatur per sacerdotium Melchisedech, qui offerebat panem et vinum, significantia, ut Augustinus dicit, ecclesiasticam unitatem, quam

of Aaron, in their oblatory view, were no way comparable to the spiritual Gospel sacrifices, in their intrinsic value, or in regard to the Divine acceptance; so neither were the blessings, or the sacrificial feasts of Aaron and his altars, worthy to be named in comparison to the spiritual blessings, or spiritual banquet, given to believers, whether by the typical or the true Melchizedek. If we interpret what the Fathers say in relation to the Melchizedekian sacrifices, as opposed to the Aaronical, by this key, everything, I presume, will be easy and clear: but without it all is confusion. I know but of one objection to this account, and that not weighty; namely, that the Fathers sometimes speak of Melchizedek as offering something to God, and not barely as distributing to Abraham and his company. But then let it be remembered, that the word offer is a word of a large and lax meaning, importing any kind of presenting, either to view, (as when Hezekiah spread a letter before the Lord [s],) or for consecration, or the like. And it is further to be noted, that the Fathers [t], some of them at least, (as Ambrose, Philastrius, Chrysostom, Austin, and perhaps Eusebius,) understood Melchizedek to have offered a sacrifice of lauds to God, besides his conveying the grand sacrifice, that is, the blessings and benefits of it, to Abraham.

XII.

Having thus far observed, by what names of distinction Christian sacrifices were discriminated from Jewish and Pagan

constituit participatio Christi: unde etiam, in nova lege, verum Christi sacrificium communicatur fidelibus sub specie panis et vini.' Aquin. part iii. q. 22. art. 6. p. 61.

[s] 2 Kings xix. 14. Isa. xxxviii. 14.

[t] Ambrosius, tom. i. p. 714. edit. Bened. Philastr. Haer. cix. p. 221; Haer. cxliv. pp. 314, 216. Chrysost. adv. Jud. Hom. vii. p. 671. tom. i. in Heb. pp. 128, 129, tom. xii. Augustin. contr. Advers. Leg. pp. 570, 571. tom. vii. Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. v. cap. 3. p. 223.

Ambrosiaster well expresses that notion, 'Quantum est inter Aaron et Christum, tantum est quodammodo inter Judaeos et Christianos; superiora etiam et sacrificia. Talia videlicet offeramus sacrificia, quae in illud sanctuarium caeleste offerri possunt: non jam pecudem et bovem, non sanguinem et adipem; omnia haec soluta sunt, et pro eis introductum est rationabile obsequium. Quid est rationabile obsequium? Quod per animam, quod per spiritum offertur. . . . Quid est Deum in spiritu adorare, nisi in charitate et fide perfecta, et spe indubia, et sanctis animae virtutibus?' Pseud-Ambros. in Heb. vi. p. 443.

jointly or singly considered, I may pass on to some other notes of distinction, by which Christian sacrifices, differently circumstantiated, were distinguished one from another. Here may come in the distinction between external and internal sacrifice, which is of very different consideration from a distinction before mentioned, between extrinsic and intrinsic.

Origen, mysticizing the two altars which belonged to the temple, the inner and the outer altar, makes mental prayer or service to answer to the incense on the one, and vocal prayer to answer the burnt offerings on the other. Such was his notion of internal and external sacrifice under the Gospel [u]. Neither is it amiss, provided we take in manual service, or good works [v], into the notion of external sacrifice, to render that branch of the division complete. But here it is to be noted, that though mental service alone may make internal sacrifice, yet vocal or manual alone, without mental, will not make external sacrifice. Outward service is but the shell and carcase of sacrifice, without the sacrifice of the heart [x]. How both the internal and external sacrifice are performed in the Eucharist, see particularly noted and explained in Dean Field [y].

XIII.

Christian sacrifices may be divided into private and public: which is a distinction somewhat like to, but not altogether the same with the former. For though internal sacrifice, as such, is always secret, yet it may be performed in company with others, as well as when we are alone: and though external sacrifice, as

[u] 'Altaria vero duo, id est interius et exterius, quoniam altare orationis indicium est, illud puto significare quod dicit Apostolus, Orabo spiritu, orabo et mente. Cum enim corde oravero, ad altare interius ingredior. . . . . Cum autem quis clara voce, et verbis cum sono prolatis, quasi ut aedificet audientes, orationem fundit ad Deum, hic spiritu orat, et offerre videtur hostiam in altari quod foris est ad holocaustomata populi constitutum.' Origen. in Num. Hom. x. p. 303.

[v] Good works were always eminently reckoned among the Christian sacrifices, as may be seen in Justin, p. 14. Clemens of Alexandria, pp. 836, 848. Chrysostom, tom. v. pp. 231, 503, and indeed in all the Fathers. How that is to be understood, see in Review, above, pp. 317, 318.

[x] Vid. Chrysostom in Rom. Hom. xx. p. 657. tom. ix. Origen. tom. ii. p. 363. ed. Bened. Nazianz. Orat. i. p. 38. Gregor. M. Dial. iv. cap. 59.

[y] Field on the Church, p. 204.

to the outward part, is open to view, may be seen or heard, yet it may be performed in private as well as in company. Therefore both external and internal sacrifices may be subdivided into private and public, accordingly as they are respectively offered up to God, either from the private closet in retirement, or from among our brethren met together in the public assemblies for the same purpose. Private prayer is private sacrifice, and public prayer is public sacrifice. Good works likewise are sacrifices, if really and strictly good, if referred to God and his glory: therefore when they are done in private, they are private sacrifices; but if so done as to 'shine before men,' for an example to them, then they become public sacrifices.

XIV.

Christian sacrifices may be distinguished likewise into lay-sacrifice and clerical. In a large sense, all good Christians are sacrificers, and, so far, priests unto God [z]. St. Austin, in few words, well sets forth both the agreement and the difference; observing that all Christians are priests, as they are members of Christ, members of one and the same High Priest; but that Bishops and Presbyters are in a more peculiar or emphatical manner entitled to the name of priests [a]. So I interpret 'proprie [b];' not to exclude Christian laics from being, properly speaking, sacrificers, but so only as to exclude them from being emphatically and eminently such as the clergy are: for though

[z] Exod. xix. 5, 6. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Revel. xx. 6. Just. Mart. Dial. p. 386. Irenaeus, lib. iv. cap. 8. p. 237. Tertullian. de Monogam. cap. vii. p. 529. Origen. in Levit. Hom. ix. pp. 236, 238. Cyrill. Hierosol. Catech. xviii. c. 33. p. 301. Ambros. in Luc. vi. Hieron. contr. Lucif. p. 290. tom. iv. Augustin. tom. viii. pp. 477, 478, 588. Leo Magn. Serm. iii. p. 107. Isidor. Pelus. lib. iii. Ep. lxxv. p. 284. And compare Review, above, pp. 351, 352. Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, p. 421.

[a] 'Erunt sacerdotes Dei et Christi, et regnabunt cum illo mille annis, Apoc. xx. 6. Non utique de solis episcopis et presbyteris dictum est, qui proprie jam vocantur in ecclesia sacerdotes: sed sicut omnes Christianos dicimus, propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, quoniam membra sunt unius sacerdotis.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xx. cap. 10. p. 588. tom. vii.

[b] Compare Whitaker upon that place of St. Austin. Answer to Reynolds, p. 77. Chrastovius de Opific. Missae, lib. i. cap. 11. p. 104. Fulke's Defence of Translations, p. 62.

they are all equally sacrificers, they are not equally administrators of sacrifice, in a public, and solemn, and authorised way.

The Protestant doctrine, commonly, has run, that clergy and laity are equally priests: not equally Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, but equally priests, (in the sense of ἱερεῖς,) that is, equally sacrificers [c]. For like as when a senate presents a petition, by their speaker, to the crown, every member of that senate is equally a petitioner, though there is but one authorized officer, one speaker commissioned to prefer the petition in the name of the whole senate; so in this other case, the whole body of Christian people are equally sacrificers, though the clergy only are commissioned to preside and officiate in a public character [d]. The sacrifice is the common sacrifice of the whole body, and so the name of sacrificer is also common: but the leading part, the administration of the sacrifice, is appropriate to the commissioned officers; and so also are the names of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. This is all that any sober Protestants have meant; though their expressions have been sometimes liable to misconstruction, by reason of the latent ambiguity of words and names. The word priest is equivocal, as denoting either a presbyter or a sacrificer: and the word sacrificer is still further equivocal, as meaning either one who barely sacrifices, or one that administers a sacrifice in a public capacity, as the head or mouth of an assembly.

Perhaps, after all, some shorter and clearer way might be thought on, for compromising the debates concerning lay-priesthood. If 'steward of the mysteries of God [e]' may be thought a good general definition of 'sacerdos,' or a title equivalent to priest [f], then the disputes about the precise meaning

[c] Cranmer against Gardiner, pp. 424, 440. Jewel's Answer to Harding, Art. xvii. p. 429. Defence of Apol. p. 576. Pet. Mart. Loc. Comm. p. 788. Hospinian. Histor. Sacram. part. i. pp. 584, 590.

[d] 'Utut omnes offerant preces, laudes, eleemosynas, et hujusmodi sacrificia, non tamen eodem modo omnes haec offerunt: nec debent homines privati pastorum munus et officium usurpare.' Sutliff. contr. Bellarmin. p. 294.

[e] 1 Cor. iv. 1.

[f] 'Aequipollent ista dispensator mysteriorum Dei, et sacerdos: mysteria namque Dei sancta sunt, et sacerdos dictus est a sacris dandis.' Chrastovius, Polan. p. 197.

of ἱερεὺς, sacrificer, and how far that name is common to clergy and laity, may be superseded, and the name of priest may be appropriated in the sense of ambassadors of God, or stewards of Divine mysteries, to the Bishops only in the first degree, and to Presbyters in the second [g], or in a third degree to Deacons also [h], as some of the ancients have estimated, perhaps not amiss.

There is yet another way of compromising this matter, viz. by passing over the Greek ἱερεὺς, sacrificer, and running higher up to the Hebrew word 'cohen [i],' as of the elder house, and primarily signifying a person of nearest access to God, or a commissioned agent between God and man. Let but that, or something of like kind, be the proper notation of priest, and then it will be a clear case that God's peculiar ambassadors in ordinary [k], solemnly set apart for that office, are more properly priests than any other persons can be justly presumed to be.

It has been thought that the Aaronical priests were as agents for men with God, and that the evangelical priests are as agents for God with men [l]. There may be something in that distinction: but considering that the evangelical priests do offer up both the spiritual sacrifices and sacrificers to God [m], as well as bring God's messages and God's blessings to men, it seems that their agency looks both ways, and perhaps equally; and they appear to be indifferently and reciprocally agents from God to man, and from man to God.

Some have made it a difficulty to conceive how a priest, being

[g] Nazianz. Carmin. tom. ii. p. 6. Eusebius, Demonstr. lib. x. cap. 6. Hieron. in Epitaph. Paulae. Optatus, lib. i. p. 15. Leo I. de Quadrig. Serm. x. Sidonius, Ep. xxv. Facundus, lib. xii. cap. 3. Cp. Basnag. Annal. tom. ii. p. 652. Hickes's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. p. 36.

[h] Optatus, lib. i. p. 15. See Hickes's Christian Priesthood, vol. i. pp. 36, 37.

[i] 'Vox כהן genuina sua significatione notat familiarioris accessûs amicum.' Vitringa, Observat. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. 2. p. 272. Cp. in Isa. vol. ii. pp. 830, 885, 950, 951.

[k] In ordinary, to distinguish them from prophets as such, who were ambassadors or legates extraordinary.

[l] 'Prophetarum et Apostolorum erat res Dei apud homines agere, sacerdotum autem res hominum apud Deum. Illi Dei legati apud homines, hi hominum patroni apud Deum. . . . Ministerium Evangelicum a sacerdotio Aaronico multum differt, idque in eo praecipue cernitur, quod illud pro Deo apud homines praecipue constitutum sit, hoc pro hominibus apud Deum.' Outram de Sacrif. lib. i. cap. 19. pp. 220, 222.

[m] See my Review, above, pp. 313, 351, 352, and compare Vitringa in Isa. lxvi. 20. p. 951.

ignorant of what passes in the heart, can be said to present to God the intrinsic and internal sacrifices of his people. The truth is, that which the priests offer, they offer in the name or in the person of the Church, as before noted[n]: and therefore what they therein do, is to be considered as the act and deed of the whole Church, independent of the knowledge, or attention, or intention, or personal virtues of the officiating ministers. Their ministration is the outward mean appointed by God, and by that appointment made the ordinary condition of God's acceptance. As God accepts not the devotions of the people, however otherwise sincere or fervent, without the outward Sacraments, (which are the ordinary instruments of conveyance, both with respect to our sacrifices and God's graces,) so he accepts not, ordinarily, of what Christians presume to offer in a solemn public way, without the external ministration of the proper officers. And why should not they be supposed as proper instruments to convey the invisible sacrifices of men to God, as to convey the invisible graces of God to men? To suppose otherwise, would be strangely depreciating the sacerdotal function, as if that were concerned only in the external part, the shell and carcase of a sacrifice, and the internal and invisible part (which, strictly, is the sacrifice) were really presented by none but the devout worshippers themselves. In this way, the devout laity (supposing the priests to be unattentive) would be the only sacrificers, and the priests, as such, would not be sacrificers at all. But it is certain that the priests, in this case, are and ought to be considered, as conveying and recommending all the invisible sacrifices, and therefore are properly sacrificers in their sacerdotal capacity, yea, and more than sacrificers, because leaders, conductors, commissioned officers in the public sacrifice, which must be accepted through them, even when they themselves (if unworthy) shall not be accepted[o]. But enough of this.

[n] See above, p. 550.

[o] To enforce this consideration, I may add, that the priesthood below will thus correspond the more aptly to the high priesthood above, if Dr. Lightfoot judged rightly in the words here following:

'Christ is a Priest for ever, still

XV.

I pass on to another very celebrated distinction of Christian sacrifices, into gratulatory and propitiatory: though we have really none of the latter sort but one, and that not properly ours, but our Lord's, performed once upon the cross, but in virtue always abiding [p].

The word propitiatory is equivocal, capable of a larger or a stricter sense. In a lax and less proper acceptation, every service well pleasing to God is propitiatory. In this view, Baptism and all our spiritual sacrifices are propitiatory: particularly almsgiving is said to propitiate in this qualified sense of the word [q]. And the Fathers frequently so apply the word, with respect to any good works [r]. Tertullian sometimes, and Cyprian often, speaks of making satisfaction to God by repentance, &c. Nevertheless, in the strict and proper sense of propitiation, expiation, or satisfaction, no service, no sacrifice, nor anything else, ever did or ever could make it, excepting only the all-prevailing sacrifice of the cross. The sacrifice of Christ from without is the meritorious cause of propitiation: our own qualifying sacrifices from within are the conditional: and the two Sacraments, ordinarily, are the instrumental. As to the material elements,

offering sacrifice to God; but no more himself, but his people's sacrifice. And that offering is twofold, viz. offering the persons of his people to God, as an acceptable living sacrifice, (Isa. viii. 18,) and offering their services as an acceptable spiritual sacrifice to God, Rev. vii. 3.' Lightfoot, tom. ii. p. 1261.

[p] 'Singuli Christiani habent duplex sacrificium, propitiatorium et eucharisticum: sed alterum habent alienum, alterum proprium. Alienum est propitiatorium a Christo oblatum.

'Singuli sacerdotes habent duplex sacrificium; propitiatorium et eucharisticum. . . . Non habent proprium sacrificium propitiatorium, nec placant suo sacrificio, sed alieno. Quod tamen neque ipsi offerunt, sed tantum accipiunt fide fructum alieni sacrificii.' Melancth. Opp. tom. iv. p. 514. 'Unicum est autem re ipsa propitiatorium, videlicet obedientia Filii Dei, quae est λύτρον pro nobis, et meretur nobis reconciliationem.' Ibid. p. 603. Cp. Cranmer, Opp. Posth. pp. 139–150. Pet. Mart. Loc. Comm. p. 704. Zanchius's Tractat. Posth. p. 421.

[q] Philipp. iv. 18. Heb. xiii. 16. Ecclus. iii. 30; xxxv. 2.

[r] 'Verum sacrificium insinuans, quod offerentes propitiabuntur Deum.' Iren. lib. iv. cap. 17. p. 248.

'Qui fraudibus abstinet, propitiat Deum.' Minuc. Fel. sect. xxxii, p. 183. Cp. Origen. in Levit. Hom. xiii. p. 255, cited in Review, above, p. 222.

in either Sacrament, they are neither an extrinsic expiation nor an intrinsic qualification, and therefore cannot, with any propriety, be called an expiatory or a propitiatory sacrifice, no not in the lowest sense of propitiatory. Indeed, the religious use of them is propitiatory, in such a sense as Christian services are so [s]: therefore our so using them, that is, our service, is the sacrifice, and not they; and it is an intrinsic and qualifying sacrifice, not extrinsic or expiatory. Nothing 'ab intus' can properly expiate, as is justly observed by a learned writer [t]: propitiate it may, but still in such a secondary, subordinate sense as has been mentioned. The extrinsic legal expiations reached only to temporals: the intrinsic, under Christ's extrinsic sacrifice, were even then the saving sacrifices, and must for ever be so. Sacraments, as such (not sacrifices), are the rights of application: the means and instruments of conveyance and reception, with respect to the benefits of the great atonement [u]. The Jewish sacrifices, considered as Sacraments, and not otherwise, were such rites. The Eucharist is eminently so now; and Baptism, perhaps, yet more eminently, as it was anciently reckoned the grand absolution, and as life is before nutriment [v].

XVI.

There is another distinction of Christian sacrifice, not so commonly observed, but worth the noting; and that is, between

[s] In this sense, propitiatory sacrifices are allowed by Protestant Divines: Cranmer against Gardiner, pp. 437, 438. Gulielm. Forbes. Consider. Modest. p. 694. Joann. Forbes. Opp. tom. i. p. 619. Spalatens. p. 283. Thorndike's Epil. b. iii. pp. 42, 46. Payne on the Sacrifice of the Mass, p. 77. Jackson, vol. iii. p. 299. Morton on the Eucharist, b. vi. pp. 60, 72, cum multis aliis.

[t] Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. pp. 299, 300. The use which the learned author intended by that principle, (that nothing 'ab intus' can expiate,) was to introduce another extrinsic, expiatory sacrifice, after Christ's. A very wrong thought; but which shews, however, that he aimed at a very different kind of propitiation and expiation than what Divines allow to intrinsic and spiritual sacrifices.

[u] How absurd the notion is of applying one expiatory sacrifice by another expiatory sacrifice, as such, has been often shewn: particularly by Morton, b. vi. cap. 11, and Sutliff. [adv. Bellarmin. pp. 233, 249, 308] and others; but by none better than by Dean Brevint's Depth and Mystery of the Rom. Mass, pp. 31–34.

[v] See my Review, above, pp. 220, 231–233, and Salmasius (alias Simplicius Verinus) contr. Grot. p. 402.

sacrifice in a large, general sense, and sacrifice in a more restrained, eminent, or emphatical meaning[x]. Our Lord's sacrifice, for instance, is eminently the sacrifice, infinitely superior to all other: not that it is more properly a sacrifice than others which equally fall within the same general definition, but it is a more excellent sacrifice: in scholastic terms, 'non magis sacrificium, sed majus:' not more a sacrifice, but a greater sacrifice.

The like may be observed of our spiritual sacrifices, compared one with another. All religious duties, all Christian services, are sacrifices properly so called: but some are more emphatically or more eminently called by that name, because of some eminent circumstances attending them, which give them the greater value and dignity. St. Austin makes every religious act, work, or service, a sacrifice[y]. Nevertheless, he supposed the work of the Eucharist, the sacrifice there offered, to be emphatically and eminently the sacrifice of the Church: the singular sacrifice[z], as being, comparatively, of singular value; and also the universal sacrifice[a], as comprehending many sacrifices of the spiritual kind, and taking in the whole redeemed city, the whole city of God.

Baptism, in St. Austin's account, was a sacrifice of a single

[x] N.B. Most of Bellarmine's arguments to prove that spiritual sacrifices are not proper sacrifices, resolve into an equivocation in the word proper; not distinguishing between proper, (that is, special,) as opposed to large, and proper as opposed to metaphorical or figurative. From thence appears the use of the present distinction.

[y] 'Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaeremus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni, quo veraciter beati esse possimus.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 242. See Review, above, p. 309, and Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, pp. 416, 417.

[z] 'Haec quippe Ecclesia est Israel secundum spiritum, a quo distinguitur ille Israel secundum carnem, qui serviebat in umbris sacrificiorum, quibus significabatur singulare sacrificium, quod nunc offert Israel secundum spiritum.' Augustin. contr. Adversar. Leg. et Prophet. lib. i. cap. 20. p. 570. tom. viii.

'Unde et in ipso verissimo et singulari sacrificio, Domino Deo nostro agere gratias admonemur.' Augustin. de Spirit. et Lit. cap. xi. p. 94. tom. x.

[a] 'Ut tota ipsa redempta civitas, hoc est, congregatio societasque sanctorum, universale sacrificium offeratur Deo, per sacerdotem magnum, &c. Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum, multi unum corpus in Christo: quod etiam sacramento altaris, fidelibus noto, frequentat Ecclesia; ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert, ipsa offeratur.' Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. x. cap. 6. p. 243. tom. vii.

person, or of a few in comparison [b]: the several single good works of every Christian were so many sacrifices in his estimation, true sacrifices, not nominal or metaphorical: but still the sacrifice offered in the Eucharist was emphatically the sacrifice of Christians, being a complicated sacrifice, the joint-worship of all, and containing many circumstances which gave it a more eminent right and title to the name of the sacrifice of the Church [c]. The Eucharist therefore was emphatically or peculiarly the sacrifice [d]: that is to say, in a peculiar manner, or with peculiar circumstances, but not in a peculiar or different sense of the name sacrifice; for those things ought to be distinguished, though they have been often confounded. All the confusion, in this matter, lies in the equivocalness of terms, and particularly of the word 'proprie,' properly, which is variously used, and is subject to various meanings [e]. It may mean proper, as opposed to improper and metaphorical: or it may mean proper, as opposed to large or general; which is the same with peculiar as to manner and circumstances only, not as to propriety of phrase or diction. All spiritual sacrifices are sacrifices properly so called, falling under the same general reason and definition of sacrifice [f]: nevertheless, the Eucharist is a sacrifice

[b] See Appendix, above, p. 483, and compare Ambros. tom. i. pp. 214, 215. Origen. tom. ii. p. 405. ed. Bened. Chrysost. in Heb. x. Hom. 20. p. 186. tom. xii. ed. Bened. Bede, Homil. tom. vii. p. 59.

[c] 'Quomodo autem Spiritui Sancto in pane et vino sacrificium Ecclesiae non offertur, quando ipsam Ecclesiam, et templum et sacrificium ipse Spiritus habere cognoscitur.' Fulgentius inter Fragment. p. 641.

[d] See Review, above, pp. 311, 312. Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, pp. 420, 421. Appendix, above, p. 483.

[e] The various meanings are these:

1. Proper, as opposed to 'aliene:' in Latin, 'proprium et alienum.'

2. Proper, as opposed to common: 'proprium et commune.'

3. Proper, as opposed to allusive or metaphorical: in Latin, 'proprie dictum, et improprie dictum.'

4. Proper or peculiar, as opposed to large or general: 'proprie, et lato modo,' or 'largo modo.'

[f] See Review, above, pp. 310, 311. Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, pp. 416, 417. N. B. The old Protestant Divines, for the most part, maintained this point against the Romanists, (who first denied it,) that spiritual sacrifices are proper sacrifices, that is, properly so called; which might be particularly proved from their standing definitions. See Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, p. 416. I shall only add here the testimony of an adversary, who speaking of the Protestants, says,

'Putant actum contritionis, laudationis, gratiarum actionis pertinere ad sacrificia proprie dicta, ex Davide,

in a more eminent way; not more a sacrifice, but a more excellent sacrifice, as I before distinguished in another case. I thought it necessary to be thus minute and explicit in this article, for the removing vulgar prejudices, and for the preventing common mistakes.

XVII.

I shall mention but one distinction more, (if it may be called a distinction,) and that is, between sacrifice real and nominal, between sacrifice truly such, and sacrifice in name only. It may sound oddly, to distinguish sacrifice into sacrifice and no sacrifice, which is really the case here; but it is necessary, for the preventing confusion, and for the obviating mistakes which frequently arise from a figurative or catachrestical use of names. This distinction of nominal and real is of large extent, comprehending under it several subdivisions; as instrumental and real, symbolical and real, verbal and real, and lastly, commemorative and real: of which in their order, as follows:

1. The first I call instrumental and real, as when the instrument of a sacrifice (whether for brevity or for any other reason) bears the name of sacrifice or oblation. Thus, for instance, jewels of gold, chains, bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets, were called an oblation for the Lord, to make an atonement for souls, before the Lord[g], as if they had really been sacrifices: but it is certain, that those offerings were no more than instru-

Psal. 1. et ex illo D. Augustini, lib. x. cap. 6. Caeterum toto caelo errant,' &c. Joan. Puteanus, q. lxxxiii. Dub. 2. p. 299. A. D. 1624. He goes on to argue the point: a bye-point, which Allen, in 1576, and Bellarmine, about twelve or twenty years after, had insisted upon, for the sake of perplexing a cause, and for the turning a reader off from the main point in dispute. For whatever becomes of the question about proper and improper sacrifice, (a strife about a name only,) one thing is certain, that spiritual services are the only true and acceptable services under the Gospel; and that material sacrifices, however proper, in respect of diction, or use of language, are now out of date, and are rejected of God, and are therefore so far from being properly worship, that they are more properly sacrilege and profanation. See my Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, pp. 415–419, 423. The Romish sacrifice is neither true nor proper; but they apply that epithet to a mere fiction and idol of their own.

[g] Num. xxxi. 50.

ments subservient to sacrifices: and that appears to have been the ground and foundation of the way of speaking [h].

By the like figure of speech, by a metonymy of instrument for principal, we sometimes find the Fathers giving the name of sacrifice to the altar-offerings, to the bread and wine; which were the instruments of the benevolent acts, as also of the memorial services, that is, of the real sacrifices. Cyprian [i], certainly, so uses the word sacrifice; and probably Tertullian before him [k]; and others after [l]. Such expressions were very innocent in ancient times, while Christians were too wise and too well instructed to make any such gross mistakes as the ignorance of later times introduced. The Fathers could not then suspect, that such figures of speech should ever come to be interpreted with rigour, and up to the letter, while sufficiently guarded by the well known standing doctrine of spiritual sacrifices. 2. By a like figure of speech, the sign or symbol of a sacrifice often bore the name of sacrifice; that is to say, by a metonymy of the sign for the thing signified [m]. Our blessed Lord had used the like figure in the very institution of the Eucharist, as it were, giving the names of body and blood to

[h] 'Aurum offerri dicitur ad expiationem pro animabus. At qui tandem auro aut fiat aut figuretur expiatio, nisi mediate et instrumenti modo? Dum scilicet suffimentis sacris, et ignitis subservit oblationibus: adeo ut nihil hic sit aliud ad expiationem offerri, quam ad usum eorum, quae expiando.' Mede, Dissertat. Triga, p. 28.

[i] 'Locuples et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare te credis, quae corban omnino non respicis, quae in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quae partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit, sumis?' Cyprian. de Opere et Eleemos. p. 242. ad. Bened.

[k] 'De stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, &c. . . . Accepto corpore Domini et conservato, utrumque salvum est, participatio sacrificii, et executio officii.' Tertull. de Orat. cap. xiv. pp. 135, 136.

[l] 'Dum sacris altaribus nullam admovent hostiam. Propterea decernimus, ut omnibus Dominicis diebus, altaris oblatio ab omnibus viris et mulieribus offeratur tam panis quam vini; ut per has immolationes, et peccatorum fascibus careant, et cum Abel vel caeteris juste offerentibus promereantur esse consortes.' Concil. Matisc. ii. Can. 4. Cp. Bona. Rer. Liturg. p. 436. A. D. 585. Apostol. Constit. lib. ii. cap. 27.

'Ille bonus Christianus est, qui. . . . oblationem quae offeratur Deo, in altari exhibet.' Eligius Noviomens. apud Bonam, ibid. p. 436. A. D. 640.

[m] How usual a figure this is, in Scripture itself, with relation especially to exhibitive signs, see proved at large, in Review, above, chap. 7. pp. 130–141. And compare St. Austin, Epist. xcviii. p. 286. tom. ii. In Levit. q. lvii. p. 516. tom. iii.

the elemental signs and symbols of them. And what wonder is it, if the Fathers, considering that the real body and blood were a sacrifice upon the cross, should sometimes call the elements by the name of sacrifice; which was but following the like figure, and saying the same thing that our Lord had said, only in equivalent terms [n]? If any one should doubt of this solution, with respect to the name of sacrifice, sometimes (though rarely in comparison) given to the elements; let him say, what other solution can be justly given for their being much more frequently called by the name of body and blood [o], yea and of Christ slain, or simply Christ, or Lord, or God, or the like [p]. Instances out of antiquity might be here given in great numbers: but I shall content myself with a single passage of St. Ambrose, wherein the elements appear to be denominated Christ, and Christ's body, and sacrifice, all in the compass of a few lines [q], and all by the same metonymy of sign for thing signified, exhibited, participated. He uses the word offer in a lax sense, for commemorating, or presenting to Divine consideration: for it cannot be supposed that he thought of literally sacrificing Christ, either above or below. Indeed, he explains his sense of that matter elsewhere [r], by Christ's presenting himself as intercessor above, in virtue of his blood shed, and by our representing the same thing below, in a kind of imagery, made of the symbols of bread and wine. Christ's offering himself

[n] 'Ad summam, regula haec tenenda est, Patres quo sensu intellexerunt corpus et sanguinem Christi adesse in coena, panemque esse ipsum corpus Christi, eodem etiam sensu erunt in coena offerri Christum, coenamque ipsam esse sacrificium hilasticum, sed incruentum; nempe in mysterio, in figura, et imagine.' Zanchius, ad Ephes. v. p. 422.

[o] 'Pene quidem Sacramentum omnes corpus ejus dicunt.' Augustin. Serm. cccliv. p. 1375. tom. v.

[p] Καὶ σὺ, τάλαν, παλάμησι τεαῖς
ἢ μύστιν ἐδωδὴν
Δέξῃ θαρσαλέως, ἢ θεὸν ἀγκαλίσεις
Χείρεσιν, αἷς διόρυξας ἐμὸν τάφον;
Nazianz. Epigr. p. 151. in Anecd. Graec. Murator. A. D. 1709.

[q] 'Etsi nunc Christus non videtur offerre, tamen ipse offertur in terris, quando Christi corpus offertur: imo ipse offerre manifestatur in nobis, cujus sermo sanctificat sacrificium quod offertur.' Ambros. in Psal. xxxviii. p. 853. ed. Bened.

[r] 'Umbra in lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in caelestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur vitulus; nunc Christus offertur. . . . Et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat. Hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit.' Ambros. de Offic. lib. ii. cap. 48.

above, is rather commemorating a sacrifice, than sacrificing[s]: and our doing the like below, is but an imitation even of that[t]; so far is it from sacrificing either the signs or things. But as the bread and wine represent the real body and blood, which were a real sacrifice, so they have the names of body, and blood, and sacrifices: and there is no more room for arguing, barely from the name of sacrifice, to real sacrifice in the one case, than there is for arguing, barely from the names of body and blood, to real body and blood, (that is to say, to transubstantiation,) in the other case. The argument proves too much to prove anything.

It may be said perhaps, that the ancients, while they call the elements body and blood, do yet by some additional words give us to understand, that they meant not the real body and blood; but where do they give us to understand, that when they called the elements a sacrifice, they did not believe them to be a real sacrifice[u]? I answer, they do it in hundreds of places: by what they say of extrinsic and intrinsic sacrifice: by what they say of visible and invisible: by what they say of material and immaterial: by what they teach of bloody and unbloody, of smoky and unsmoky, of false and true, of old and new, of literal and spiritual; and in short, by the whole tenor of their doctrine concerning spiritual sacrifices, for six whole centuries together. Could we suppose, that they made the elements themselves a proper sacrifice, they would be all over perplexity, confusion, and self-contradiction: but allow only, that they made use of the same easy and common figure when they called them sacri-

[s] Vid. Grotius de Satisfact. in fine. Compare Review, p. 66.

[t] 'As Christ is a Priest in heaven for ever, and yet does not sacrifice himself afresh, (nor yet without sacrifice could he be a Priest,) but by a daily ministration and intercession represents his sacrifice to God, and offers himself as sacrificed; so he does upon earth, by the ministry of his servants. He is offered to God: that is, he is, by prayers and the Sacrament, represented or offered up to God as sacrificed; which, in effect, is a celebration of his death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church, as we are capable, by a ministry like to his in heaven.' Taylor, Great Exempl. p. 497. Cp. Grotius, Opp. tom. iv. pp. 620, 643, 660. Field, pp. 204, 205. Hospinian. Histor. Sacram. p. 580, &c. Bucer. contr. Latom. pp. 147, 175, 249. Brevint on the Mass. p. 74.

[u] See Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 455.

fice, as when they called them body and blood, and Christ slain, or the like [x], and then their whole doctrine is consistent, uniform, and clear, all the way through, and without embarrassments. But I proceed.

3. To the head of nominal and real, I refer verbal and real. The Latin name 'sacrificium,' through the unskilfulness of declining ages, came to be used as equivalent to the word 'sacramentum:' so that when the Church writers of those times called the elements a sacrifice, they really meant no more than a sacrament, that is, sign of a sacrifice. The idea remained the same as before; but there was a change in the terms, a confusion in words or names. This is plain from the old definition of sacrifice given by the famous Isidore of Seville, about the close of the sixth century, or beginning of the seventh. He defines sacrifice by a thing made sacred [y]; which is rather the definition of a sacrament, as denoting an holy sign, or a thing, before

[x] It may be noted that Vasquez (who admits not the elements to be a sacrifice) assigns three reasons why the Fathers might so call them: the first of the three is adapted to the Romish principles: but the second and third are good.

1. 'Quia sunt materia, quae transit in id quod in sacrificium offertur.

2. 'Quia ipsum Christi corpus vocatur panis, et sanguis vinum.

3. 'Quia proponuntur Deo consecranda: latius autem patet oblatio quam sacrificium.' Vasquez, Opp. tom. iii. p. 414.

'Alia ratione dici potest panis et vinum Deo offerri, si non addatur in sacrificium: quia hoc ipso quod proponitur coram Deo consecrandum, Deo offertur; latius enim patet oblatio quam sacrificium: et hoc modo explicari possent aliquae orationes Ecclesiae in officio missae, in quibus dicitur panis et vinum offerri, vel illorum propositio dicitur oblatio.' Vasquez, ibid.

[y] 'Sacrificium est . . . omne quod Deo datur, aut dedicatur, aut consecratur. Sacrificium dictum, quasi sacrum factum: quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicae passionis: unde hoc, eo jubente, corpus et sanguinem dicimus. Quod dum fit ex fructibus terrae, sanctificatur et fit Sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei.' Isidor. Hispalens. Orig. lib. vi. cap. 19. pp. 142, 143.

This description, or definition, seems to have prevailed among the Irish Divines of the seventh and eighth centuries. See Usher's Relig. of Ancient Irish, chap. iv.

Cangius, under the word 'sacrificium,' in his Glossary, has brought no higher authorities for such use of the name than the seventh century; excepting Patricius, whose pretended writings are of suspected credit.

Rabanus of the ninth century, (De Instit. Cleric. lib. i. cap. 32,) Honorius of the twelfth, (Gemm. Anim. cap. 93,) and Alensis of the thirteenth, (tom. iv. p. 192,) seem to follow Isidore. As also do several of the elder Romanists of the sixteenth century: such as Fisher, Tonstall, &c.

common, consecrated into an holy symbol: and it will serve as aptly for the waters of Baptism as for the elements of the Eucharist. It would be ridiculous to claim Isidore, as making the elements a sacrifice, in the old or true sense of that name: his sacrifice was verbal only, not real; a verbal sacrifice, a real sacrament. However, in process of time, this change of language, this misapplication of a name, might, very probably, become a snare to many; and might, with several other concurring circumstances, during the dark ages, help to bring in bread-sacrifice. When transubstantiation, or something like it, was creeping in, one argument pleaded for it ran thus: either the elements must be the real and natural body and blood, or else the Christian sacrifices will be meaner than the Jewish sacrifices were[z]. Which shews, that the bread-sacrifice, or elemental sacrifice, was then made a principle whereon to build, and therefore had gained some footing in the Church before that time. Then, that very consideration which should have made them look back, to correct their first error, served only, in those days of ignorance, to lead them on to more and greater. If an elemental sacrifice is meaner (as it really is) than a Jewish one, and they were sensible of it, they should have corrected that false principle by returning to spiritual sacrifice, and then all had been right: they should have considered the elements as symbols of Christ's body, natural and mystical, and as instruments of a memorial-service, and so all had been well.

If it should here be objected, that in this way of distinguishing between the material symbol and spiritual service, even the Jewish sacrifices might all be distinguished off into services, and no room left for material sacrifices under the Law, any more than under the Gospel: I say, if this should be objected, it is obvious to reply, that the two cases are exceeding wide, and the circumstances extremely different; for,

1. Material things are frequently called sacrifices under the Law, and accepted as sweet odour; but the elements are never so called under the Gospel, nor accepted of, as sweet odours.

[z] Paschas. Radbert de Corp. et Sang. cap. ii. Opp. p. 1559. Algerus, p. 268.

2. Under the Law, God considered the fat and the blood as his portion, to be separated from man's use; and he accepted them as entirely his [a]: no such thing is appointed with respect to the elements under the Gospel; neither does God accept them, or any part of them as his, or as exempt from man's use.

3. Legal and typical expiations (sure marks of a proper legal sacrifice) were annexed to the Jewish oblations: but no such typical and temporal expiations, distinct from the true expiation, is annexed to the oblation of the elements, to shew them to be a sacrifice in themselves [b].

4. Under the Law, there was need of extrinsic sacrifices, and extrinsic expiations, to signify, by such shadows, that men must be saved by an extrinsic sacrifice, to appear in due time; namely, the grand sacrifice [c]: but under the Gospel, the true sacrifice is come, and so that great truth is no longer shadowed, or darkly insinuated, but openly and fully declared. And we have now direct immediate access to the true sacrifice, and to the true expiations: not kept at a distance, as before, by the intervention of typical sacrifices, or typical expiations: such is our Gospel privilege [d].

5. All sacrifices, properly expiatory, must be something extrinsic, for nothing 'ab intus' can expiate, as before noted [e]. The extrinsic thing, in such a case, is demanded by way of price, or compensation, for the forfeited life of the man, or in lieu of it [f]. Therefore as the Jewish sacrifices were properly expiatory,

[a] See Review, above, pp. 135, 136, and compare Mede's Christian Sacrifice, p. 471. Cudworth on the Sacrament, chap. v. pp. 89, 90. Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part i. p. 238. part ii. p. 77, &c.

[b] Eusebius well observes, that God accepted of animal sacrifices, while as yet no better sacrifice of expiation could be had; that is, while the sacrifice of Christ, signified by the other, was yet future: but afterwards the case was altered, and all such sacrifices were superseded by the sacrifice of Christ. Vid. Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 36.

[c] 'Spiritualis effectus est solutio a reatu interno, &c. quam sacrificia adumbrant, non praestant . . . Sed si sacrificia adumbrant ac significant ablationem reatus aeterni, necesse est ut substernatur effectus temporalis, per quem spiritualis ille effectus repraesentetur: is vero est ablatio reatus, ratione poenae temporalis.' Vossius ad Judic. Ravensp. p. 86; cp. p. 98.

[d] See Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, pp. 443, 444. App. pp. 460–462.

[e] See above, p. 599.

[f] Vid. Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 35.

(though in a legal and temporal way [g],) they must of course be extrinsic to the persons, and they were so: but Christians owning no expiation at all, save only the true and heavenly expiation made upon the cross, cannot have any expiatory or atoning sacrifice besides that. They may have, and they have, intrinsic, gratulatory, and qualifying sacrifices; and those are their religious duties and services, and nothing else. Therefore the reason is plain, why the Jewish sacrifices, cannot be distinguished off, or advanced into spiritual services nor the Christian sacrifices sunk into material and extrinsic oblations. But I return.

4. To the same head, of nominal and real, belongs the distinction of commemorative and real: which is an old distinction. Chrysostom observes, that we do not offer, as the Jews formerly did, one lamb one day, and the next day another, and so on; but that we every day offer the same Lamb, which Lamb is Christ, and consequently the same sacrifice; or rather, as he adds, correcting the expression, a commemoration of a sacrifice [h]. Thus he distinguishes a commemorative sacrifice from a real one, or a commemoration of a sacrifice from the sacrifice itself. That he here understood an expiatory sacrifice is plain, because he interprets it of Christ himself, our only sacrifice of propitiation. It may be suggested, that a commemoration of a sacrifice, though it is not that sacrifice, may yet be a sacrifice, or another sacrifice notwithstanding: and it may be said, that a symbol of a sacrifice may itself also be a distinct sacrifice. Both parts are true:

[g] Hence arises another irresistible argument against the notion of the elements being expiatory sacrifices: for, if they were so, they should have a real and distinct expiation of their own, to adumbrate the true sacrifice as future still: which would amount to declaring that Christ is not come, and so would be a flat contradiction to Christianity.

[h] *Τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ . . . . τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀεὶ προσφέρομεν, οὐ νῦν μὲν ἕτερον πρόβατον, αὔριον δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ὥστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία . . . εἷς πανταχοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς . . . πολλαχοῦ προσφερόμενος, ἓν σῶμά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ πολλὰ σώματα, οὕτω καὶ μία θυσία. . . . οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν καθάπερ ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.* Chrysost. in Heb. x. Hom. xvii. pp. 168, 169. tom. xii. edit. Bened. Other authorities to the same purpose are referred to in Review, above, p. 34, and more might be added.

for a memorial service is a sacrifice[i], while it is also a commemoration of the grand sacrifice; and the Jewish sacrifices were sacrifices in themselves, while types of Christ's sacrifice, and symbols also of ours. But then, let it be observed, that when Chrysostom here speaks of the real sacrifice in the Eucharist, he does not mean the signs, but the thing signified by them, namely, Christ himself, the one sacrifice, as he expressly mentions: besides, had he intended the elements, he could not have said, that we have one sacrifice, or always the same sacrifice; for he very well knew, that we offer one day one loaf, and another day another loaf, and so that would have amounted to the same with one day one sheep, and another day another; and the very objection which he was there answering would have returned upon him with all its force.

But will not the same objection lie against offering any sacrifices at all, even spiritual sacrifices, so many distinct acts, and therefore one day one sacrifice, and another day another, and so on? No: for Chrysostom was there speaking only of expiatory sacrifices, or sin offerings; as the chapter, which he was commenting upon, led him to do: and there is really no sin offering, or expiatory sacrifice, under the Gospel, but Christ alone; who is not properly offered in a sacrificial way, but commemorated only, in the Eucharist. There may be in the Eucharist gratulatory sacrifices, consistently with what is here said by Chrysostom:

[i] Eusebius observes, that our Lord has ordered us a memorial, instead of a sacrifice; *μνήμην καὶ ἡμῖν παραδοὺς, ἀντὶ θυσίας, τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν.* Demonstr. lib. i. c. 10. p. 38. One would think by this, that he had excluded a memorial from being a sacrifice. But he does not: for he presently after explains what he means by, instead of a sacrifice, adding *ἀντὶ τῶν πάλαι θυσιῶν καὶ ὁλοκαυτωμάτων*, instead of the ancient sacrifices and burnt offerings. Ibid. p. 38. But as to the memorial services, he does as plainly call them sacrifices, in the next page. as words can do it.

Τὰ σεμνὰ τῆς Χριστοῦ τραπέζης θύματα, δι' ὧν καλλιεροῦντες, τὰς ἀναίμους καὶ λογικὰς, αὐτῷ τε προσηνεῖς θυσίας προσφέρειν Θεῷ, &c. p. 39. Where I understand by *σεμνὰ θύματα* the symbols, metonymically called victims, as body and blood: and Eusebius takes notice, that by them (that is, by them as symbols and instruments) we offer, we perform our unbloody and rational sacrifices. He had said before, *Τούτου δῆτα θύματος τὴν μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέζης ἐκτελεῖν διὰ συμβόλων*, &c. That is, the memorial of the victim, Christ crucified, is performed by those symbols; by consecrating, by breaking, distributing, pouring, eating, and drinking them with devout hearts, prayers, praises, &c.

but whether the elements or the service, properly, are such gratulatory sacrifices, he has not determined in this place, not entering into that question; though he has sufficiently determined it elsewhere, by what he constantly teaches with respect to self-sacrifice, intrinsic sacrifice, and all spiritual services; which he called sacrifices without any scruple, and without any self-correction [k].

Some have thought, that the very phrase of commemorative sacrifice, as applied to the Eucharist, imports, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice: but that is a very great mistake. It neither implies it nor contradicts it, but abstracts from it, expressing no more than this, that the Eucharist is a commemoration of a sacrifice, namely, of the grand sacrifice. It is a contracted, compendious form of speech, which, drawn out at full length, expresses a sacrament commemorative of a sacrifice; as appears from Aquinas [l], who may be allowed to be a good interpreter of a scholastic phrase. That sense passed current, and was not only admitted by Calvin and other Protestants, but contended for, when the Romanist began to give a new sense and new turn to it. Cardinal Allen was not pleased with the Schools for speaking the plain truth [m], nor with the Protestants for following

[k] It has been observed by some, that the spiritual sacrifices, among the Fathers, often go under metaphorical names, such as odour of suavity, and the like: and it has been urged, as of moment, that if a sacrifice of the heart is not an odour of suavity in a proper sense, why must it be thought a sacrifice in a proper sense? The argument is wrong, because it proves too much. Our Lord, as a sacrifice, is called our Passover, and the Lamb of God, and likewise an odour of suavity, Ephes. v. 2. Might it not therefore as well be pleaded against his sacrifice, that since he is not a lamb, nor a passover, nor an odour, in a proper sense, why must he be a sacrifice in a proper sense? The truth is, proper sacrifices may often have metaphorical names: but they are proper sacrifices notwithstanding, if they fall within the general reason and definition of sacrifice. The sacrifices called 'zebachim,' for instance, in Hebrew, or *θυσίαι* in Greek, or 'hostiae' in Latin, or 'victimae,' were not therefore sacrifices merely because so called, or because they were of such a particular kind, but because they were considered as presents to God, and as expressions of worship and homage offered to the Divine Majesty.

[l] 'Sacramentum hoc est commemorativum Dominicae passionis, quae fuit verum sacrificium, et sic nominatur sacrificium.' Aquin. Summ. part iii. qu. 73. art. 4.

'Successit autem ei [paschati] in Novo Testamento Eucharistia, sacramentum quod est rememorativum praeteritae passionis, sicut et illud erat praefigurativum futurae.' Aquin. ibid. art. 5. Cp. Lombard. lib. iv. distinct. 12. lit. G.

[m] Alanus de Eucharistia, p. 551.

them in that just sense of the phrase: so he endeavoured to warp it to a new and foreign meaning [n]. He pleaded that a commemorative sacrifice may consistently be proper also; which was no part of the question. The question was, whether any certain conclusion could be drawn from the name of sacrifice, sometimes given to the elements by the ancients, when those very ancients declared their own meaning in such instances to be, that the Eucharist, so considered, was a commemoration of a sacrifice, rather than a sacrifice. But I pass on. The phrase of commemorative sacrifice, in such a sense as Aquinas used it in, and as signifying a sacrament commemorative of a sacrifice, has been admitted by the best learned Protestants[o] all along, without any scruple. The sum is, that a commemorative sacrifice, in the relative sense of the phrase, is the same as a nominal sacrifice, opposed to a real one; a sign opposed to the thing signified; a memorial of a sacrifice, not that sacrifice. Such was the original, such has been the customary use of the phrase, from the time it first came in: and the question is not, whether a commemorative sacrifice may not also, in an absolute view, be a distinct sacrifice; but whether that phrase ordinarily had expressed both? It is certain, that it had not; but, among the Schoolmen formerly, and among the best learned Protestants since, it expressed no more commonly than a sacramental commemoration or memorial of a sacrifice, namely of the grand sacrifice. In this sense, our present most learned Metropolitan admits of it. His words are: 'In the Christian Church, there is only one proper sacrifice, which our Lord offered upon the cross; and consequently Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice in a literal and strict sense, without allowing transubstantiation.' (p. 262.) The

[n] 'Majores certe nostri cum Eucharistiae confectionem appellarunt nonnunquam commemorativum sacrificium . . . non ita dicebant, quod judicarent haec vocabula non consistere cum sacrificio vero, ut propterea non esset proprie dictum sacrificium, quia esset commemorativum.' Alanus de Eucharistia, p. 547.

[o] Cranmer against Gardiner, book v. p. 435. R. Jacobi Epist. ad Perron. p. 52. Andrewes, Resp. ad. Bellarm. p. 184. Spalatensis, lib. v. pp. 82, 83, 149, 204, 882, 911. Buckeridge, p. 4. See my Christian Sacrifice, above, p. 431. Morton, book v. p. 440, alias 35, 38. Field, p. 205. Laud, Conf. pp. 305, 306. Towerson on the Sacraments, p. 169. Payne on the Sacrifice of the Mass, pp. 49, 51, 53, 75. Patrick, Mens. Myst. pp. 15, 16. Brevint on the Mass, p. 23.

Lord's Supper is 'a commemorative sacrifice, or the memorial of our Lord offered upon the cross; which is first dedicated to God by prayer and thanksgiving, and afterwards eaten by the faithful,' &c. (p. 267.) When it is said, that Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice in a literal sense, and that there is but one proper sacrifice for Christians to partake of; the meaning, I presume, of those few, chosen words is this: we may indeed partake of Christ's sacrifice, a proper sacrifice, but not in a literal sense; for the participation is spiritual: we may literally partake of the elements; but then they are not a proper sacrifice, but symbolical, and commemorative [p], being that they are memorial signs of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself. Therefore, upon the whole, we have no sacrifice to partake of in a literal sense; for either the sacrifice we partake of is not literal and proper, or else the participation, at least, is not literal and proper: so stands the case. And what is this but very plainly declaring, that the elements are not a proper sacrifice? Well, but is it not as plainly declaring, that spiritual sacrifices are no proper sacrifices, since we have but one proper sacrifice? No, it is not declaring any such thing: for, observe the words, Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice; it is not said, cannot offer, but the thought entirely runs upon a sacrifice of participation [q]. So there is room left to say, that we offer proper sacrifices, namely, spiritual sacrifices. But will there not also be room left for saying, that we offer the elements as a proper sacrifice? No: for if they are not a proper sacrifice when participated, they could not be such when offered [r]: if the feeding barely

[p] 'The elements are made the symbols of his body and blood, the partaking whereof is all one to the receivers, and does as much assure them of the favour of God, as if they should eat and drink the real body and blood of Christ offered upon the cross.' p. 263. 'To eat of the Lord's Supper, is to partake of the sacrifice of Christ, which is there commemorated and represented.' Archbishop Potter on Church Government, p. 264.

[q] Accordingly, these words are added: 'Hence it is manifest, that to eat of the Lord's Supper is to partake of the sacrifice of Christ, which is there commemorated and represented.' Ibid. p. 264.

Sacrifice is here taken in the passive view, as participated, according to Dr. Cudworth's notion of a symbolical feast upon a sacrifice. See my Review, above, p. 291, &c.

[r] Offered here means offered for consecration: 'To consecrate the Lord's Supper is so constantly called προσφέρειν in Greek, and 'offerre' in

upon them amounts not to a feast upon a proper sacrifice, they never were a proper sacrifice at all. The words are so exactly chosen, as plainly to exclude the elements from being a proper sacrifice, and at the same time not to exclude our religious services from really being so. This, I presume to say, (without his Grace's leave or knowledge,) appears to be his sense, and his whole sense; no way favouring the material hypothesis, but the contrary; however some may have misconstrued his words, for want of considering them with due attention.

As to the name memorial, it may be noted, that it is capable of a twofold meaning, according as it may be applied. Apply it to the elements, and so it means a memorial sign, no sacrifice at all: apply it to the prayers, praises, and eucharistical actions [s], and then it means a memorial service, and is a sacrifice, a spiritual sacrifice. But it is time to take leave.

I have now run through the most considerable distinctions of sacrifice, which have fallen within the compass of my observation; and I am willing to hope, that the explications here given may be of use, as spreading some further light upon the subject. Had the difference lain in words only [t], (ideas remaining the

Latin, that it is needless to cite any testimonies for them.' Ibid.

N.B. The offering for consecration, means no more than presenting them to God, in order to have them consecrated into memorial signs, or symbols of Christ's sacrifice, that is, into a commemorative, not real sacrifice.

[s] 'Recordatio ergo, seu commemoratio, ponitur . . . in rebus sensibilibus. Omnia enim memorialia, seu monumenta, sunt sensibilia et patentia sensui: ac propterea benedictio illa sensibilis, fractio, distributio, comestio panis sacramentalis, nobis est memoriale passionis Christi,' &c. Spalatens, p. 83.

[t] Pfaffius, in the view he took of it, and with respect to one learned writer, looked upon the dispute as a kind of logomachy, pp. 53, 344, and pref. p. 7, which I noted in Review, above, p. 309, adding, that there was a good deal of truth in what Pfaffius had said, and that a great part of the debate was chiefly about names. I have since noted, that the original scheme of a principal writer in that cause appeared to me to be little more. Christian Sacrifice Explained, above, p. 442. But I was well aware, that some writers had carried matters a great deal further. Where a road first divides, two travellers may almost shake hands; but if one goes on here, and another there, as far as the diverging roads will lead them, they may at length be found at a very wide difference from each other: so it is here. An equivocal word, perhaps, or phrase, in which both parties agree, first strikes out two very different ideas; and those two ideas, having their different trains or connections, do at length carry the two parties off, wide and far from each other, into very opposite systems.

same,) it would not have deserved one moment's care or thought: but as this question had been lately managed, it is too plain, that the true idea both of the sacrament and sacrifice had been changed into quite another thing; and that such a change could not be supported, without making other very considerable changes in the whole system of theology, and in points of high consequence both to truth and godliness. Wherefore it appeared as necessary to endeavour, with all Christian mildness, to set these matters right, as it was to 'contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints.'

'Faxit Deus omnipotens, ut uni Christi sacrificio vere innitamur, ac illi rursus rependamus sacrificia nostra gratiarum actionis, laudis, confessionis nominis sui, verae resipiscentiae ac poenitentiae, beneficentiae erga proximos, aliorumque omnium pietatis officiorum: talibus enim sacrificiis, exhibebimus nos nec in Deum ingratos, nec Christi sacrificio indignos [u].'

[u] Cranmer in Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. Collection of Records, p. 84.

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

A SELECTION OF

BOOKS

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY

HENRY FROWDE,

AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,

7 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

ALSO TO BE HAD AT THE

CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY, OXFORD.

LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, &c.

(See also Clarendon Press Series, pp. 21, 24.)

A Greek-English Lexicon, by Henry George Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. Sixth Edition, Revised and Augmented. 1870. 4to. cloth, *1l.* 16*s.*

A copious Greek-English Vocabulary, compiled from the best authorities. 1850. 24mo. bound, 3*s.*

A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Second Edition. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Latin Dictionary, founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D., and Charles Short, LL.D., Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York. 1879. 4to. cloth, *1l.* 5*s.*

The Book of Hebrew Roots, by Abu 'l-Walîd Marwân ibn Janâh, otherwise called Rabbî Yônâh. Now first edited, with an Appendix, by Ad. Neubauer. 1875. 4to. cloth, *2l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on the use of the Tenses in Hebrew. By S. R. Driver, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hebrew Accentuation of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job. By William Wickes, D.D. 1881. Demy 8vo. stiff cover, 5*s.*

Thesaurus Syriacus: collegerunt Quatremère, Bernstein, Lorsbach, Arnoldi, Field: edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.P.R.

Fasc. I–V. 1868–79. sm. fol. each, 1*l.* 1*s.*
Vol. I, containing Fasc. I–V. sm. fol. cloth, 5*l.* 5*s.*

A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, arranged with reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the use of English Students, by Monier Williams, M.A., Boden Professor of Sanskrit. Fourth Edition, 1877. 8vo. cloth, 15*s.*

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically arranged, with special reference to Greek, Latin, German, Anglo-Saxon, English, and other cognate Indo-European Languages. By Monier Williams, M.A., Boden Professor of Sanskrit. 1872. 4to. cloth, 4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

Nalopákhyánam. Story of Nala, an Episode of the Mahá-Bhárata: the Sanskrit text, with a copious Vocabulary, and an improved version of Dean Milman's Translation, by Monier Williams, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Improved. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 15*s.*

Sakuntalā. A Sanskrit Drama, in seven Acts. Edited by Monier Williams, M.A. Second Edition, 1876. 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the MS. Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D., Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. Edited and enlarged by Prof. T. N. Toller, M.A., Owens College, Manchester. (To be completed in four parts). Parts I and II. 4to. 15*s.* each. *Just Published.*

An Icelandic-English Dictionary, based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfússon. With an Introduction, and Life of Richard Cleasby, by G. Webbe Dasent, D.C.L. 1874. 4to. cloth, 3*l.* 7*s.*

A List of English Words the Etymology of which is illustrated by comparison with Icelandic. Prepared in the form of an APPENDIX to the above. By W. W. Skeat, M.A., stitched, 2*s.*

A Handbook of the Chinese Language. Parts I and II, Grammar and Chrestomathy. By James Summers. 1863. 8vo. half bound, 1*l.* 8*s.*

An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, arranged on an Historical Basis. By W. W. Skeat, M.A., Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge. 1882. 4to. cloth, 2*l.* 4*s.*

Part IV., completing the Work, 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. 1882. Crown 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

GREEK CLASSICS, &c.

Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiae. Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendicis loco additae sunt Diogenis Laertii Vita Heracliti, Particulae Hippocratei De Diaeta Libri Primi, Epistolae Heracliteae. 1877. 8vo. cloth, price 6*s.*

Homer: A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer; to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D., Member of the General Council, University of Edinburgh. 1880. 4to. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Plato: The Apology, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 1878. 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

Plato: Philebus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 1860. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Plato: Sophistes and Politicus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 1866. 8vo. cloth, 18*s.*

Plato: Theaetetus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. New Edition in the Press.

Plato: The Dialogues, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek. A new Edition in 5 volumes, medium 8vo. 1875. cloth, 3*l.* 10*s.*

Plato: The Republic, translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Plato: Index to. Compiled for the Second Edition of Professor Jowett's Translation of the Dialogues. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. 1875. 8vo. paper covers, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Thucydides: Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. By B. Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek. 2 vols. 1881. Medium 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 12*s.*

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, &c.

The Holy Bible in the earliest English Versions, made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers: edited by the Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. 4 vols. 1850. Royal 4to. cloth, 3*l.* 3*s.*

Also reprinted from the above, with Introduction and Glossary by W. W. Skeat, M.A.

The New Testament in English, according to the Version by John Wycliffe, about A.D. 1380, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon: according to the Wycliffite Version made by Nicholas de Hereford, about A.D. 1381, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Holy Bible: an exact reprint, page for page, of the Authorized Version published in the year 1611. Demy 4to. half bound, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum. Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. Editio Altera. 18mo. cloth, 18*s.*

Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta. Edidit Fridericus Field, A.M. 2 vols. 1867–1874. 4to. cloth, 5*l.* 5*s.*

Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Latina, cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica. Edidit B. Thorpe, F.A.S. 1835. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Gallica e Cod. MS. in Bibl. Bodleiana adservato, una cum Versione Metrica aliisque Monumentis pervetustis. Nunc primum descripsit et edidit Franciscus Michel, Phil. Doct. 1860. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Psalms in Hebrew without points. 1879. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Book of Wisdom: the Greek Text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorised English Version; with an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. By William J. Deane, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford; Rector of Ashen, Essex. Small 4to. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Book of Tobit. A Chaldee Text, from a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; with other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations, and the Itala. Edited by Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 1878. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs. Attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra. Edited from a Manuscript in the Bodleian Library by S. R. Driver, M.A. Crown 8vo. paper cover, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, a J. Lightfoot. A new Edition, by R. Gandell, M.A. 4 vols. 1859. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Novum Testamentum Graece. Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in ordine parallelo dispositi. Accedit collatio Codicis Sinaitici. Edidit E. H. Hansell, S.T.B. Tomi III. 1864. 8vo. half morocco, 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Novum Testamentum Graece. Accedunt parallela S. Scripturae loca, necnon vetus capitulorum notatio et canones Eusebii. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S. T. P. R., necnon Episcopus Oxoniensis. 18mo. cloth, 3*s.*

The same on writing paper, with large margin, cloth, 10*s.*

Novum Testamentum Graece juxta Exemplar Millianum. 18mo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The same on writing paper, with large margin, cloth, 9*s.*

Evangelia Sacra Graece. fcap. 8vo. limp, 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version:—

(1) Pica type. Second Edition, with Marginal References. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

(2) Long Primer type. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

(3) The same, on writing paper, with wide margin, cloth, 15*s.*

Canon Muratorianus: the earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament. Edited with Notes and a Facsimile of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D. 1868. 4to. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, &c.

St. Athanasius: Orations against the Arians. With an Account of his Life by William Bright, D.D. 1873. Crown 8vo. cloth, 9*s.*

St. Athanasius: Historical Writings, according to the Benedictine Text. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

St. Augustine: Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises, and the Acts of the Second Council of Orange. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. cloth, 9*s.*

The Canons of the First Four General Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. 1877. Crown 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils. By William Bright, D.D. 1882. Crown 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas. Edidit P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi II. 1868. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 2*s.*

Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in D. Joannis Evangelium. Accedunt Fragmenta Varia necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium Diaconum Duo. Edidit post Aubertum P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi III. 1872. 8vo. 2*l.* 5*s.*

Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini Commentarii in Lucae Evangelium quae supersunt Syriace. E MSS. apud Mus. Britan. edidit R. Payne Smith, A.M. 1858. 4to. cloth, 1*l.* 2*s.*

The same, translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 2 vols. 1859. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balaei, aliorumque Opera Selecta. E Codd. Syriacis MSS. in Museo Britannico et Bibliotheca Bodleiana asservatis primus edidit J. J. Overbeck. 1865. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, according to the text of Burton, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1872. Crown 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

Irenaeus: The Third Book of St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, against Heresies. With short Notes and a Glossary by H. Deane, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. 1874. Crown 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Patrum Apostolicorum, S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, quae supersunt. Edidit Guil. Jacobson, S.T.P.R. Tomi II. Fourth Edition, 1863. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Socrates' Ecclesiastical History, according to the Text of Hussey, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1878. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, &c.

Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited, with English Notes, by G. H. Moberly, M.A. 1881. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bright (*W., D.D.*). *Chapters of Early English* Church History. 1878. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.*

Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England. A new Edition. Carefully revised, and the Records collated with the originals, by N. Pocock, M.A. 7 vols. 1865. 8vo. *Price reduced to* 1*l.* 10*s.*

Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Edited, after Spelman and Wilkins, by A. W. Haddan, B.D., and W. Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford. Vols. I. and III. 1869–71. Medium 8vo. cloth, each 1*l.* 1*s.*

Vol. II. Part I. 1873. Medium 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. Part II. 1878. Church of Ireland; Memorials of St. Patrick. Stiff covers, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hammond (*C. E.*). *Liturgies, Eastern and Western.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Liturgical Glossary. 1878. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

An Appendix to the above. 1879. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 1*s.* 6*d.*

John, Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Ecclesiastical History. [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A. 1853. 4to. cloth, 1*l.* 12*s.*

The same, translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 1860. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.*

Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. The occasional Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury the Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms, with dissertations and notes. By William Maskell, M.A. Second Edition. 1882. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 10*s.*

The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged in parallel columns, with preface and notes. By William Maskell, M.A. Third Edition. 1882. 8vo. cloth, 15*s.*

The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. By F. E. Warren, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

The Leofric Missal. By the same Editor. In the Press.

Records of the Reformation. The Divorce, 1527–1533. Mostly now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other libraries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 1870. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, *1l.* 16*s.*

Shirley (W. W.). Some Account of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Second Edition, 1874. fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stubbs (W.). Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. 1858. small 4to. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

Butler's Works, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 1874. 8vo. cloth, 11*s.*

Butler's Sermons. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Butler's Analogy of Religion. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Heurtley's Collection of Creeds. 1858. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 1859. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's Works, with his Life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. Sixth Edition, 1874. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Hooker's Works; the text as arranged by John Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 1875. 8vo. cloth, 11*s.*

Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. Sixth Edition, 1877. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, with a Preface by the present Bishop of London. 1880. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Wheatly's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. A new Edition, 1846. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

Wyclif. A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif, by W. W. Shirley, D.D. 1865. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wyclif. Select English Works. By T. Arnold, M.A. 3 vols. 1871. 8vo. cloth. *Price reduced to* 1*l.* 1*s.*

Wyclif. Trialogus. With the Supplement now first edited. By Gotthard Lechler. 1869. 8vo. cloth. *Price reduced to* 7*s.*

HISTORICAL AND DOCUMENTARY WORKS.

British Barrows, a Record of the Examination of Sepulchral Mounds in various parts of England. By William Greenwell, M.A., F.S.A. Together with Description of Figures of Skulls, General Remarks on Prehistoric Crania, and an Appendix by George Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S. 1877. Medium 8vo. cloth, 25*s.*

Britton. A Treatise upon the Common Law of England, composed by order of King Edward I. The French Text carefully revised, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by F. M. Nichols, M.A. 2 vols. 1865. Royal 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 16*s.*

Clarendon's (Edw. Earl of) History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. 7 vols. 1839. 18mo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

Clarendon's (Edw. Earl of) History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Also his Life, written by himself, in which is included a Continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion. With copious Indexes. In one volume, royal 8vo. 1842. cloth. 1*l.* 2*s.*

Clinton's Epitome of the Fasti Hellenici. 1851. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Clinton's Epitome of the Fasti Romani. 1854. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.*

Freeman's (E. A.) History of the Norman Conquest of England; its Causes and Results. In Six Volumes. 8vo. cloth, 5*l.* 9*s.* 6*d.*

Vols. I–II together, 3rd edition, 1877. 1*l.* 16*s.*
Vol. III, 2nd edition, 1874. 1*l.* 1*s.*
Vol. IV, 2nd edition, 1875. 1*l.* 1*s.*
Vol. V, 1876. 1*l.* 1*s.*
Vol. VI. Index. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Freeman (E. A.). The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 16*s.*

Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary ("Liber Veritatum"): Selected Passages, illustrating the condition of Church and State, 1403–1458. With an Introduction by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.P. Small 4to. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Magna Carta, a careful Reprint. Edited by W. Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History. 1879. 4to. stitched, 1*s.*

Olaf. Passio et Miracula Beati Olavi. Edited from a Twelfth-Century MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, with an Introduction and Notes, by Frederick Metcalfe, M.A. Small 4to. stiff cover, 6*s.*

Protests of the Lords, including those which have been expunged, from 1624 to 1874; with Historical Introductions. Edited by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 1875. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 2*s.*

Rogers's History of Agriculture and Prices in England, A.D. 1259–1793.

Vols. I and II (1259–1400). 1866. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 2*s.*
Vols. III and IV (1401–1582). 1882. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 10*s.*

Sturlunga Saga, including the Islendinga Saga of Lawman Sturla Thordsson and other works. Edited by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfússon. In 2 vols. 1878. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 2*s.*

Two of the Saxon Chronicles parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossarial Index, by J. Earle, M.A. 1865. 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

Statuta Universitatis Oxoniensis. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 5*s*.

The Student's Handbook to the University and Colleges of Oxford. Sixth Edition. 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s*. 6*d*.

MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

Astronomical Observations made at the University Observatory, Oxford, under the direction of C. Pritchard, M.A., Savilian Professor of Astronomy. No. 1. 1878. Royal 8vo. paper covers, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Treatise on Infinitesimal Calculus. By Bartholomew Price, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Oxford.

Vol. I. Differential Calculus. Second Edition, 8vo. cloth, 14*s*. 6*d*.

Vol. II. Integral Calculus, Calculus of Variations, and Differential Equations. Second Edition, 1865. 8vo. cloth, 18*s*.

Vol. III. Statics, including Attractions; Dynamics of a Material Particle. Second Edition, 1868. 8vo. cloth, 16*s*.

Vol. IV. Dynamics of Material Systems; together with a chapter on Theoretical Dynamics, by W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S. 1862. 8vo. cloth, 16*s*.

Rigaud's Correspondence of Scientific Men of the 17th Century, with Table of Contents by A. de Morgan, and Index by the Rev. J. Rigaud, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. 2 vols. 1841–1862. 8vo. cloth, 18*s*. 6*d*.

Vesuvius. By John Phillips, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, Oxford. 1869. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s*. 6*d*.

Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames. By the same Author. 1871. 8vo. cloth, 21*s*.

Synopsis of the Pathological Series in the Oxford Museum. By H. W. Acland, M.D., F.R.S., 1867. 8vo. cloth, 2*s*. 6*d*.

Thesaurus Entomologicus Hopeianus, or a Description of the rarest Insects in the Collection given to the University by the Rev. William Hope. By J. O. Westwood, M.A., F.L.S. With 40 Plates. 1874. Small folio, half morocco, 7*l*. 10*s*.

Text-Book of Botany, Morphological and Physiological. By Dr. Julius Sachs, Professor of Botany in the University of Würzburg. *A New Edition.* Translated by S. H. Vines, M.A. Royal 8vo. 1*l*. 11*s*. 6*d*. *Just Published.*

Johannes Müller on Certain Variations in the Vocal Organs of the Passeres that have hitherto escaped notice. Translated by F. J. Bell, B.A., and edited with an Appendix, by A. H. Garrod, M.A., F.R.S. With Plates. 1878. 4to. paper covers, 7*s.* 6*d.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bacon's Novum Organum. Edited, with English notes, by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. 1855. 8vo. cloth, 9*s.* 6*d.*

Bacon's Novum Organum. Translated by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. 1855. 8vo. cloth, 9*s.* 6*d.* (See also p. 37.)

The Works of George Berkeley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces, Annotations, and an Account of his Life and Philosophy, by Alexander Campbell Fraser, M.A. 4 vols. 1871. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 18*s.*

The Life, Letters, &c. 1 vol. cloth, 16*s.* See also p. 37.

The Logic of Hegel; translated from the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Prolegomena by William Wallace, M.A. 1874. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

Smith's Wealth of Nations. A new Edition, with Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 1880. cloth, 21*s.*

A Course of Lectures on Art, delivered before the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1870, by John Ruskin, M.A., Slade Professor of Fine Art. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

Aspects of Poetry; being Lectures delivered at Oxford by John Campbell Shairp, LL.D., Professor of Poetry, Oxford. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford. By J. C. Robinson, F.S.A. 1870. Crown 8vo. cloth, 4*s.*

Catalogue of the Castellani Collection of Antiquities in the University Galleries, Oxford. By W. S. W. Vaux, M.A., F.R.S. Crown 8vo. stiff cover, 1*s.*

The Sacred Books of the East.

TRANSLATED BY VARIOUS ORIENTAL SCHOLARS, AND EDITED BY F. MAX MÜLLER.

Vol. I. *The Upanishads.* [Translated by F. Max Müller.] Part I. The *Khândogya*-upanishad, The Talavakâra-upanishad, The Aitareya-âra*n*yaka, The Kaushîtaki-brâhma*na*-upanishad, and The Vâ*g*asaneyi-sa*m*hitâ-upanishad. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, as taught in the Schools of Âpastamba, Gautama, Vâsish*th*a, and Baudhâyana. [Translated by Prof. Georg Bühler.] Part I, Âpastamba and Gautama. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. III. *The Sacred Books of China.* The Texts of Confucianism. [Translated by James Legge.] Part I. The Shû King, The Religious portions of the Shih King, and The Hsiâo King. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. IV. *The Vendîdâd.* Translated by James Darmesteter. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. V. *The Bundahis*, *Bahman Yast*, *and Shâyast-lâ-Shâyast.* Pahlavi Texts, Part I. Translated by E. W. West. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Vols. VI and IX. *The Qur'ân.* Parts I and II. Translated by Professor E. H. Palmer. 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

Vol. VII. *The Institutes of Vishnu.* Translated by Professor Julius Jolly. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. VIII. *The Bhagavadgîtâ*, *Sanatsugâtîya*, *and Anugîtâ.* Translated by Kâshinâth Trimbak Telang. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. X. *The Dhammapada*, translated by Professor F. Max Müller; and *The Sutta Nipâta*, translated by Professor Fausböll; being Canonical Books of the Buddhists. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. XI. *The Mahâparinibbâna Sutta*, *The Tevigga Sutta*, *The Mahâsudassana Sutta*, *The Dhamma-Kakkappavattana Sutta.* Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. XII. *The Satapatha-Brâhma*na. Translated by Professor Eggeling. Vol. I. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. XIII. *The Pâtimokkha.* Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids. *The Mahâvagga,* Part I. Translated by Dr. H. Oldenberg.

Vol. XVI. *The Yî King*, with an Appendix on the Philosophy of the Scholars of the Sung dynasty, professedly derived from the Yî. Translated by James Legge.

The following Volumes are in the Press:—

Vol. XIV. *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, as taught in the Schools of Vâsish*th*a and Baudhâyana. Translated by Professor Georg Bühler.

Vol. XV. *The Upanishads*. Part II. Translated by F. Max Müller.

Vol. XVII. *The Mahâvagga, and Kullavagga*. Part II. Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids and Dr. H. Oldenberg.

Vol. XVIII. *The Dâdistân-î Dînîk, and Epistles of Mânûskihar*. Pahlavi Texts, Part II. Translated by E. W. West.

Vol. XIX. *The Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king*. Translated by Samuel Beal.

Vol. XX. *The Vâyu-Purâna*. Translated by Professor Bhandarkar, of Elphinstone College, Bombay.

Vol. XXI. *The Saddharma-pundarîka*. Translated by Professor Kern.

Vol. XXII. *The Âkârânga-Sûtra*. Translated by Professor Jacobi.

Anecdota Oxoniensia:

Classical Series. Vol. I. Part I. *The English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics*, described in relation to Bekker's Manuscripts and other Sources. By J. A. Stewart, M.A., Classical Lecturer, Christ Church. Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Classical Series. Vol. I. Part II. *Nonius Marcellus*, de Compendiosa Doctrina, Harleian MS. 2719. Collated by J. H. Onions, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church. Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Semitic Series. Vol. I. Part I. *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah*. By Rabbi Saadiah. Edited by H. J. Matthews, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford. Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Aryan Series. Vol. I. Part I. *Buddhist Texts from Japan*. Edited by F. Max Müller. Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mediaeval and Modern Series. Vol. I. Part I. *Sinonoma Bartholomei;* A Glossary from a Fourteenth-Century MS. in the Library of Pembroke College, Oxford. Edited by J. L. G. Mowat, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College. Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Clarendon Press Series

The Delegates of the Clarendon Press having undertaken the publication of a series of works, chiefly educational, and entitled the Clarendon Press Series, have published, or have in preparation, the following.

Those to which prices are attached are already published; the others are in preparation.

I. ENGLISH.

A First Reading Book. By Marie Eichens of Berlin; and edited by Anne J. Clough. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 4*d.*

Oxford Reading Book, Part I. For Little Children. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6*d.*

Oxford Reading Book, Part II. For Junior Classes. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6*d.*

An Elementary English Grammar and Exercise Book. By O. W. Tancock, M.A., Head Master of Norwich School. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

An English Grammar and Reading Book, for Lower Forms in Classical Schools. By O. W. Tancock, M.A., Head Master of Norwich School. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Typical Selections from the best English Writers, with Introductory Notices. Second Edition. In Two Volumes. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Vol. I. Latimer to Berkeley. Vol. II. Pope to Macaulay.

The Philology of the English Tongue. By J. Earle, M.A., formerly Fellow of Oriel College, and Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Book for the Beginner in Anglo-Saxon. By John Earle, M.A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

An Anglo-Saxon Reader. In Prose and Verse. With Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

An Anglo-Saxon Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Ormulum; with the Notes and Glossary of Dr. R. M. White. Edited by Rev. R. Holt, M.A. 1878. 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

Specimens of Early English. A New and Revised Edition. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By R. Morris, LL.D., and W. W. Skeat, M.A.

Part I. From Old English Homilies to King Horn (A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1300). Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 9*s.*

Part II. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower (A.D. 1298 to A.D. 1393). Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Specimens of English Literature, from the 'Ploughmans Crede' to the 'Shepheardes Calender' (A.D. 1394 to A.D. 1579). With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman, by William Langland. Edited, with Notes, by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Chaucer. The Prioresses Tale; Sir Thopas; The Monkes Tale; The Clerkes Tale; The Squieres Tale, &c. Edited by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Chaucer. The Tale of the Man of Lawe; The Pardoneres Tale; The Second Nonnes Tale; The Chanouns Yemannes Tale. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.* (See also p. 19.)

Old English Drama. *Marlowe's Tragical History* of Dr. Faustus, and Greene's Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Edited by A. W. Ward, M.A., Professor of History and English Literature in Owens College, Manchester. 1878. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Marlowe. *Edward II.* With Introduction, Notes, &c. By O. W. Tancock, M.A., Head Master of Norwich School. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Shakespeare. *Hamlet.* Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., and W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 2*s.*

Shakespeare. Select Plays. Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers.

The Tempest, 1*s.* 6*d.*	King Lear, 1*s.* 6*d.*
As You Like It, 1*s.* 6*d.*	A Midsummer Night's Dream, 1*s.* 6*d.*
Julius Cæsar, 2*s.*	Coriolanus, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Richard the Third, 2*s.* 6*d.*	Henry the Fifth, 2*s.*

Twelfth Night. *In the Press.* (For other Plays, see p. 19.)

Milton. *Areopagitica.* With Introduction and Notes. By J. W. Hales, M.A., late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Bunyan. *Holy War.* Edited by E. Venables, M.A. In the Press. (See also p. 20.)

Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A., Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Addison. Selections from Papers in the Spectator. With Notes. By T. Arnold, M.A., University College. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Burke. Four Letters on the Proposals for Peace with the Regicide Directory of France. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* (See also p. 20.)

Also the following in paper covers:—

Goldsmith. The Deserted Village. 2*d.*

Gray. Elegy and Ode on Eton College. 2*d.*

Johnson. Vanity of Human Wishes. With Notes by E. J. Payne, M.A. 4*d.*

Keats. Hyperion, Book I. With Notes by W. T. Arnold, B.A. 4*d.*

Milton. With Notes by R. C. Browne, M.A.

Lycidas, 3*d.* L'Allegro, 3*d.* Il Penseroso, 4*d.* Comus, 6*d.* Samson Agonistes, 6*d.*

Parnell. The Hermit. 2*d.*

Scott. Lay of the Last Minstrel. Introduction and Canto I, with Preface and Notes by W. Minto, M.A. 6*d.* *Just Published.*

A SERIES OF ENGLISH CLASSICS,

Designed to meet the wants of Students in English Literature, by the late Rev. J. S. BREWER, M.A., of Queen's College, Oxford, and Professor of English Literature at King's College, London.

1. *Chaucer. The Prologue to the Canterbury* Tales; The Knightes Tale; The Nonne Prestes Tale. Edited by R. Morris, Editor of Specimens of Early English, &c., &c. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* (See also p. 17.)

2. *Spenser's Faery Queene.* Books I and II. Designed chiefly for the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By G. W. Kitchin, M.A.

   Book I. Eighth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

   Book II. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

3. *Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I.* Edited by R. W. Church, M.A., Dean of St. Paul's; formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

4. *Shakespeare.* Select Plays. Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and W. Aldis Wright, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers.

   I. The Merchant of Venice. 1*s.*

   II. Richard the Second. 1*s.* 6*d.*

   III. Macbeth. 1*s.* 6*d.* (For other Plays, see p. 18.)

5. *Bacon.*

I. Advancement of Learning. Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

II. The Essays. With Introduction and Notes. By J. R. Thursfield, M.A., Fellow and formerly Tutor of Jesus College, Oxford.

6. *Milton.* Poems. Edited by R. C. Browne, M.A. 2 vols. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Sold separately, Vol. I. 4*s.*; Vol. II. 3*s.* (See also p. 19.)

7. *Dryden.* Select Poems. Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell; Astræa Redux; Annus Mirabilis; Absalom and Achitophel; Religio Laici; The Hind and the Panther. Edited by W. D. Christie, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

8. *Bunyan. The Pilgrim's Progress, Grace* Abounding, Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan. Edited, with Biographical Introduction and Notes, by E. Venables, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

9. *Pope.* With Introduction and Notes. By Mark Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

I. Essay on Man. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

II. Satires and Epistles. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2*s.*

10. *Johnson. Rasselas; Lives of Pope and* Dryden. Edited by Alfred Milnes, B.A. (London), late Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

11. *Burke.* Select Works. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, and Fellow of University College, Oxford.

I. Thoughts on the Present Discontents; the two Speeches on America. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

II. Reflections on the French Revolution. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* (See also p. 18.)

12. *Cowper.* Edited, with Life, Introductions, and Notes, by H. T. Griffith, B.A., formerly Scholar of Pembroke College, Oxford.

I. The Didactic Poems of 1782, with Selections from the Minor Pieces, A.D. 1779–1783. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

II. The Task, with Tirocinium, and Selections from the Minor Poems, A.D. 1784–1799. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

II. LATIN.

An Elementary Latin Grammar. By John B. Allen, M.A., Head Master of Perse Grammar School, Cambridge. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

A First Latin Exercise Book. By the same Author. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

A Second Latin Exercise Book. By the same Author. *Preparing.*

Anglice Reddenda, or Easy Extracts, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Passages for Translation into Latin. For the use of Passmen and others. Selected by J. Y. Sargent, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

First Latin Reader. By T. J. Nunns, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Second Latin Reader. In Preparation.

Caesar. The Commentaries (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By Charles E. Moberly, M.A.

Part I. *The Gallic War.* Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. *The Civil War.* Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Civil War. Book I. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Cicero. Selection of interesting and descriptive passages. With Notes. By Henry Walford, M.A. In three Parts. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.* Each Part separately, limp, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Part I. Anecdotes from Grecian and Roman History.

Part II. Omens and Dreams: Beauties of Nature.

Part III. Rome's Rule of her Provinces.

Cicero. Selected Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Cicero. Select Orations (for Schools). With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Cornelius Nepos. With Notes. By Oscar Browning, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Livy. Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In Parts, limp, each 1*s.* 6*d.*

Part I. The Caudine Disaster.
Part II. Hannibal's Campaign in Italy.
Part III. The Macedonian War.

Livy. Books V–VII. With Introduction and Notes. By A. R. Cluer, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ovid. Selections for the use of Schools. With Introductions and Notes, and an Appendix on the Roman Calendar. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A., Professor of Humanity, Glasgow. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Pliny. Selected Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Catulli Veronensis Liber. Iterum recognovit, apparatum criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 1878. Demy 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

A Commentary on Catullus. By Robinson Ellis, M.A. 1876. Demy 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

Catulli Veronensis Carmina Selecta, secundum recognitionem Robinson Ellis, A.M. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Cicero de Oratore. With Introduction and Notes, by A. S. Wilkins, M.A., Professor of Latin, Owens College, Manchester.

Book I. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* Book II. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

Cicero's Philippic Orations. With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. Second Edition. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Cicero. Select Letters. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. Third Edition. 1881. Demy 8vo. cloth, 18*s.*

Cicero. Select Letters. Text. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.*

Cicero pro Cluentio. With Introduction and Notes. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Horace. With a Commentary. Volume I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. By Edward C. Wickham, M.A., Head Master of Wellington College. Second Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. cloth, 12*s.*

Horace. A reprint of the above, in a size suitable for the use of Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.* 6*d.*

Livy, Book I. With Introduction, Historical Examination, and Notes. By J. R. Seeley, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, Cambridge. Third Edition. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

Ovid. P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis. Ex Novis Codicibus Edidit. Scholia Vetera Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indice addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Persius. The Satires. With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A. Edited by Henry Nettleship, M.A. Second Edition. 1874. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Virgil. With Introduction and Notes, by T. L. Papillon, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. Two vols. crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* *Just Published.*

Selections from the less known Latin Poets. By North Pinder, M.A. 1869. Demy 8vo. cloth, 15*s.*

Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin. With Introductions and Notes. 1874. By John Wordsworth, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 18*s.*

Tacitus. The Annals. With Essays and Notes. Preparing.

Vergil: Suggestions Introductory to a Study of the Aeneid. By H. Nettleship, M.A. 8vo. sewed, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Ancient Lives of Vergil; with an Essay on the Poems of Vergil, in connection with his Life and Times. By H. Nettleship, M.A. 8vo. sewed, 2*s.*

The Roman Satura: its original form in connection with its literary development. By H. Nettleship, M.A. 8vo. sewed, 1*s.*

A Manual of Comparative Philology. By T. L. Papillon, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of New College. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. By William Young Sellar, M.A., Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh. VIRGIL. 1877. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

The Roman Poets of the Republic. By the same Author. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

III. GREEK.

A Greek Primer, for the use of beginners in that Language. By the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L. Bishop of St. Andrews. Sixth Edition, Revised and Enlarged Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Graecae Grammaticae Rudimenta in usum Scholarum. Auctore Carolo Wordsworth, D C.L. Nineteenth Edition 1877. 12mo. cloth, 4*s.*

A Greek-English Lexicon, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Nineteenth Edition. Carefully Revised throughout. 1880. Square 12mo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective; their forms, meaning, and quantity; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with references to the passages in which they are found. By W. Veitch. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Elements of Greek Accentuation (for Schools): abridged from his larger work by H. W. Chandler, M.A., Waynflete Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth. 2*s.* 6*d.*

A Series of Graduated Greek Readers:—

First Greek Reader. By W. G. Rushbrooke, M.L., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Second Classical Master at the City of London School. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Second Greek Reader. By A. M. Bell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Third Greek Reader. In Preparation.

Fourth Greek Reader; being Specimens of Greek Dialects. With Introductions and Notes. By W. W. Merry, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Fifth Greek Reader. Part I. Selections from Greek Epic and Dramatic Poetry, with Introductions and Notes. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. By the same Editor. In Preparation.

The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry; being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose, being a collection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., and J. E. L. Shadwell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound (for Schools). With Introduction and Notes, by A. O. Prickard, M.A., Fellow of New College. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Aeschylus. Agamemnon. With Introduction and Notes by Arthur Sidgwick, M.A., Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master of Rugby School. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Aeschylus. The Choephoroe. With Introduction and Notes by the same Editor. Preparing.

Aristophanes. In Single Plays, edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo.

The Clouds, 2*s.* The Acharnians, 2*s.*

Other Plays will follow.

Arrian. Selections (for Schools). With Notes. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., Head Master of Bedford School.

Cebes. Tabula. With Introduction and Notes by C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Euripides. Alcestis (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Euripides. Helena. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Herodotus. Selections from. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Map, by W. W. Merry, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII (for Schools). By W. W. Merry, M.A. Twenty-fourth Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Book II, separately, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. Odyssey, Books XIII–XXIV (for Schools). By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

Homer. Iliad, Book I (for Schools). By D. B. Monro, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Homer. Iliad, Books VI and XXI. With Introduction and Notes. By Herbert Hailstone, M.A., late Scholar of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* each.

Lucian. Vera Historia (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Plato. Selections (for Schools). With Notes. By B. Jowett, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek; and J. Purves, M.A., Fellow and late Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford. In the Press.

Sophocles. In Single Plays, with English Notes, &c. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrew's, and Evelyn Abbott, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp.

Oedipus Tyrannus. New and Revised Edition. 2*s.*

Oedipus Coloneus, Antigone, 1*s.* 9*d.* each.

Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, Philoctetes, 2*s.* each.

Sophocles. Oedipus Rex: Dindorf's Text, with Notes by the present Bishop of St. David's. Ext. fcap. 8vo. limp, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Theocritus (for Schools). With Notes. By H. Kynaston, M.A. (late Snow), Head Master of Cheltenham College. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Xenophon. Easy Selections (for Junior Classes). With a Vocabulary, Notes, and Map. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., and C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Xenophon. Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., Head Master of Bedford School. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Xenophon. Anabasis, Book II. With Notes and Map. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Aristotle's Politics. By W. L. Newman, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

Aristotelian Studies. I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By. J. C. Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 1879. Medium 8vo. stiff, 5*s.*

Demosthenes and Aeschines. The Orations of Demosthenes and Æschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. 1872. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.*

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII. Edited with English Notes, Appendices, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A., and the late James Riddell, M.A. 1876. Demy 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

Homer. Iliad. With Introduction and Notes. By D. B. Monro, M.A., Vice-Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. Preparing.

A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect. By D. B. Monro, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* *Just ready.*

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A., Professor of Greek, St. Andrews, formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 2 vols.

Vol. I. Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone. Second Edition. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

Vol. II. Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes. Fragments 1881. 8vo. cloth, 16*s.*

Sophocles. The Text of the Seven Plays. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions. By E. L. Hicks, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

IV. FRENCH.

An Etymological Dictionary of the French Language, with a Preface on the Principles of French Etymology. By A. Brachet. Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Brachet's Historical Grammar of the French Language. Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Short History of French Literature. By George Saintsbury, M.A. Crown 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* *Just ready.*

Specimens of French Literature, from Villon to Hugo. Selected and arranged by the same Editor. *Preparing.*

A Primer of French Literature. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

French Classics, Edited by GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A.

Corneille's Cinna, and Molière's Les Femmes Savantes. With Introduction and Notes. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Racine's Andromaque, and Corneille's Le Menteur. With Louis Racine's Life of his Father. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, and Racine's Athalie. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Selections from the Correspondence of Madame de Sévigné and her chief Contemporaries. Intended more especially for Girls' Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Voyage autour de ma Chambre, by Xavier de Maistre; Ourika, by *Madame de Duras;* La Dot de Suzette, by *Fievée;* Les Jumeaux de l'Hôtel Corneille, by *Edmond About;* Mésaventures d'un Écolier, by *Rodolphe Töpffer.* Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Regnard's Le Joueur and Brueys and Palaprat's Le Grondeur. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Louis XIV and his Contemporaries; as described in Extracts from the best Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century. With English Notes, Genealogical Tables, &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

V. GERMAN.

LANGE'S German Course. By HERMANN LANGE, Teacher of Modern Languages, Manchester:

The Germans at Home; a Practical Introduction to German Conversation, with an Appendix containing the Essentials of German Grammar. Second Edition. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The German Manual; a German Grammar, a Reading Book, and a Handbook of German Conversation. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Grammar of the German Language. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

This 'Grammar' is a reprint of the Grammar contained in 'The German Manual,' and, in this separate form, is intended for the use of Students who wish to make themselves acquainted with German Grammar chiefly for the purpose of being able to read German books.

German Composition; Extracts from English and American writers for Translation into German, with Hints for Translation in footnotes. In the Press.

Lessing's Laokoon. With Introduction, English Notes, etc. By A. Hamann, Phil. Doc., M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Wilhelm Tell. A Drama. By Schiller. Translated into English Verse by E. Massie, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

Also, Edited by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Phil. Doc., Professor in King's College, London:

Goethe's Egmont. With a Life of Goethe, &c. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. With a Life of Schiller; an historical and critical Introduction, Arguments, and a complete Commentary. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. A Comedy. With a Life of Lessing, Critical Analysis, Complete Commentary, &c. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Schiller's Historische Skizzen; Egmonts Leben und Tod, and Belagerung von Antwerpen. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris. A Drama. With a Critical Introduction and Notes. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.*

Modern German Reader. A Graduated Collection of Prose Extracts from Modern German writers:—

Part I. With English Notes, a Grammatical Appendix, and a complete Vocabulary. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Parts II and III in Preparation.

Lessing's Nathan der Weise. With Introduction, Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.* *Just ready.*

In Preparation.

Becker's (K. F.) Friedrich der Grosse.

Schiller's Maria Stuart. With Notes, Introduction, &c.

Schiller's Jungfrau von Orleans. With Notes, Introduction, &c.

Selections from the Poems of *Schiller* and *Goethe.*

VI. MATHEMATICS, &c.

Figures Made Easy: a first Arithmetic Book. (Introductory to 'The Scholar's Arithmetic.') By Lewis Hensley, M.A., formerly Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6*d.*

Answers to the Examples in Figures made Easy, together with two thousand additional Examples formed from the Tables in the same, with Answers. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1*s.*

The Scholar's Arithmetic; with Answers to the Examples. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

The Scholar's Algebra. An Introductory work on Algebra. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Book-keeping. By R. G. C. Hamilton, Financial Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trade, and John Ball (of the Firm of Quilter, Ball, and Co.), Co-Examiners in Book-keeping for the Society of Arts. New and enlarged Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp cloth, 2*s.*

A Course of Lectures on Pure Geometry. By Henry J. Stephen Smith, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.

Acoustics. By W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy, Oxford. 1870. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism. By J. Clerk Maxwell, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

An Elementary Treatise on Electricity. By the same Author. Edited by William Garnett, M.A. Demy 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Statics. By G. M. Minchin, M.A., Professor of Applied Mathematics in the Indian Engineering College, Cooper's Hill. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

A Treatise on the Kinetic Theory of Gases. By Henry William Watson, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1876. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on the Application of Generalised Coordinates to the Kinetics of a Material System. By H. W. Watson, M.A., and S. H. Burbury, M.A. 1879. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

Geodesy. By Colonel Alexander Ross Clarke, C.B., R.E. 1880. 8vo. cloth, 12*s.* 6*d.*

VII. PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

A Handbook of Descriptive Astronomy. By G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. Third Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. cloth, 28*s.*

A Cycle of Celestial Objects. Observed, Reduced, and Discussed by Admiral W. H. Smyth, R.N. Revised, condensed, and greatly enlarged by G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. 1881. 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

Chemistry for Students. By A. W. Williamson, Phil. Doc., F.R.S., Professor of Chemistry, University College, London. A new Edition, with Solutions. 1873. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Heat, with numerous Woodcuts and Diagrams. By Balfour Stewart, LL.D., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in Owens College, Manchester. Fourth Edition. 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Lessons on Thermodynamics. By R. E. Baynes, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church, Oxford, and Lee's Reader in Physics. 1878. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Forms of Animal Life. By G. Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S., Linacre Professor of Physiology, Oxford. Illustrated by Descriptions and Drawings of Dissections. A New Edition in the Press.

Exercises in Practical Chemistry. Vol. I. Elementary Exercises. By A. G. Vernon Harcourt, M.A.; and H. G. Madan, M.A. Third Edition. Revised by H. G. Madan, M.A. Crown 8vo. cloth, 9*s.*

Tables of Qualitative Analysis. Arranged by H. G. Madan, M.A. Large 4to. paper covers, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Crystallography. By M. H. N. Story-Maskelyne, M.A., Professor of Mineralogy, Oxford; and Deputy Keeper in the Department of Minerals, British Museum. In the Press.

VIII. HISTORY.

The Constitutional History of England, in its Origin and Development. By William Stubbs, D.D., Regius Professor of Modern History. Library Edition. Three vols. demy 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 8*s.*

Also in 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 12*s.* each.

Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I. Arranged and Edited by W. Stubbs, M.A. Fourth Edition. 1881. Crown 8vo. cloth, 8*s.* 6*d.*

A History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century. By Leopold Von Ranke. Translated by Resident Members of the University of Oxford, under the superintendence of G. W. Kitchin, M.A., and C. W. Boase, M.A. 1875. 6 vols. 8vo. cloth, 3*l.* 3*s.*

A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England. By E. A. Freeman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Genealogical Tables illustrative of Modern History. By H. B. George, M.A. Second Edition. Small 4to. cloth, 12*s.*

A History of France. With numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. By G. W. Kitchin, M.A. In Three Volumes. 1873–77. Crown 8vo. cloth, each 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. 1. Second Edition. Down to the Year 1453.

Vol. 2. From 1453–1624.

Vol. 3. From 1624–1793.

A History of Germany and of the Empire, down to the close of the Middle Ages. By J. Bryce, D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford.

A History of British India. By S. J. Owen, M.A., Reader in Indian History in the University of Oxford.

A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers of the Marquess Wellesley, K.G., during his Government of India. Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A., formerly Professor of History in the Elphinstone College, Bombay. 1877. 8vo. cloth, *1l.* 4*s.*

A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers relating to India of Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington, K.G. By the same Editor. 1880. 8vo. cloth, 24*s.*

A History of the United States of America. By E. J. Payne, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and Fellow of University College, Oxford. In the Press.

A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. By George Finlay, LL.D. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and Edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 1877. 7 vols. 8vo. cloth, 3*l.* 10*s.*

A Manual of Ancient History. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

A History of Greece. By E. A. Freeman, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

Italy and her Invaders, A.D. 376–476. By T. Hodgkin, Fellow of University College, London. Illustrated with Plates and Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, *1l.* 12*s.*

IX. LAW.

The Elements of Jurisprudence. By Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L., Chichele Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, and Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Institutes of Justinian, edited as a recension of the Institutes of Gaius. By the same Editor. Second Edition, 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quatuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. cloth, 18*s.*

Select Titles from the Digest of Justinian. By T. E. Holland, D.C.L., Chichele Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, and Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and C. L. Shadwell, B.C.L., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

Also sold in Parts, in paper covers, as follows:—

Part I. Introductory Titles. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. Family Law. 1*s.*

Part III. Property Law. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1). 3*s.* 6*d.*

Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 2). 4*s.* 6*d.*

An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. By Jeremy Bentham. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence. By William Markby, M.A., Judge of the High Court of Judicature, Calcutta. Second Edition, with Supplement. 1874. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* Supplement separately, 2*s.*

Alberici Gentilis, I.C.D., I.C. Professoris Regii, De Iure Belli Libri Tres. Edidit Thomas Erskine Holland I.C.D., Iuris Gentium Professor Chicheleianus, Coll. Omn. Anim. Socius. necnon in Univ. Perusin. Iuris Professor Honorarius. 1877. Small 4to. half morocco, 21*s.*

International Law. By William Edward Hall, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Demy 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

An Introduction to the History of the Law of Real Property, with original Authorities. By Kenelm E. Digby, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. 1876. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Principles of the English Law of Contract, and of Agency in its Relation to Contract. By Sir William R. Anson, Bart., D.C.L., Warden of All Souls College, Oxford. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.* *Just ready.*

X. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

Bacon. Novum Organum. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A., Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. 1878. 8vo. cloth, 14*s.*

Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A., Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.*

Selections from Berkeley, with an Introduction and Notes. For the use of Students in the Universities. By Alexander Campbell Fraser, LL.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.* (See also p. 13.)

The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. By T. Fowler, M.A., Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. Seventh Edition, with a Collection of Examples. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Elements of Inductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities. By the same Author. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 6*s.*

A Manual of Political Economy, for the use of Schools. By J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A., formerly Professor of Political Economy, Oxford. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

XI. ART, &c.

A Handbook of Pictorial Art. By R. St. J. Tyrwhitt, M.A., formerly Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. With coloured Illustrations, Photographs, and a chapter on Perspective by A. Macdonald. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. half morocco, 18*s.*

A Music Primer for Schools. By J. Troutbeck, M.A., Music Master in Westminster School, and R. F. Dale, M.A., B. Mus., Assistant Master in Westminster School. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Harmony. By Sir F. A. Gore Ouseley, Bart., Professor of Music in the University of Oxford. Second Edition. 4to. cloth, 10*s.*

A Treatise on Counterpoint, Canon, and Fugue, based upon that of Cherubini. By the same Author. Second Edition. 4to. cloth, 16*s.*

A Treatise on Musical Form and General Composition. By the same Author. 4to. cloth, 10*s.*

The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice. By John Hullah. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

XII. MISCELLANEOUS.

The Construction of Healthy Dwellings; namely Houses, Hospitals, Barracks, Asylums, &c. By Douglas Galton, late Royal Engineers, C.B., F.R.S., &c. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Treatise on Rivers and Canals, relating to the Control and Improvement of Rivers, and the Design, Construction, and Development of Canals. By Leveson Francis Vernon-Harcourt, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford, Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. 2 vols. (Vol. I, Text. Vol. II, Plates.) 8vo. cloth, 21*s.*

A System of Physical Education: Theoretical and Practical. By Archibald Maclaren. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Specimens of Lowland Scotch and Northern English. By Dr. J. A. H. Murray. Preparing.

English Plant Names from the Tenth to the Fifteenth Century. By J. Earle, M.A. Small fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5*s.*

An Icelandic Prose Reader, with Notes, Grammar, and Glossary by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfússon and F. York Powell, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Dante. Selections from the Inferno. With Introduction and Notes. By H. B. Cotterill, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Tasso. La Gerusalemme Liberata. Cantos i, ii. With Introduction and Notes. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Modern Greek Language in its relation to Ancient Greek. By E. M. Geldart, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Handbook of Phonetics, including a Popular Exposition of the Principles of Spelling Reform. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4*s.* 6*d.*

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE,

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, 7 PATERNOSTER ROW,

OXFORD: CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY,

116 HIGH STREET.

The DELEGATES OF THE PRESS *invite suggestions and advice from all persons interested in education; and will be thankful for hints, &c. addressed to the* SECRETARY TO THE DELEGATES, *Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

4000